

Citation for published version:

Rofcanin, Y 2017, 'HR Differentiation: A Double-Edged Sword? HR Differentiation ', Ph.D., University of Warwick.

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Publisher Rights
Unspecified
© The Author

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

HR Differentiation: A Double Edged Sword?

by Yasin Rofcanin

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of PhD

University of Warwick

Warwick Business School

Organization & HRM Division

2016

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	ii
Declaration on Inclusion of Material from a Prior Thesis	i
Abstract	iii
List of Abbreviations	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	7
2.1 Research Approaches to the Implementation and Effects of HR Practices	7
2.1.1 Universalistic approach to HRM	7
2.1.2 Configurational approach	8
2.1.3 Contingency approach	9
2.1.4 Beyond the contingency approach: Differentiation of HR practices	9
2.2 Differentiated HR Practices	10
2.2.1 Concept of idiosyncratic deals	10
2.2.2 Related constructs	11
2.2.3 Measurement issues	12
2.2.4 Theoretical frameworks	13
2.2.5 Disentangling negotiation and attainment of i-deals	15
2.2.6 Theoretical framework of Study 1	16
2.2.7 Theoretical framework of Study 2	17
2.3 Role of Fairness Perceptions and Social Context in Differentiated HR Practices	18
2.3.1 Concept of flexitime	18
2.3.2 Effects of flexitime from a fairness perspective	19
2.3.3 Role of social context: Concept of normativeness of flexitime	21
2.3.4 Theoretical framework of Study 3	22

2.4 Summary	23
Chapter 3: What Seals the I-Deal? Exploring the Role of Employees' Behaviours and Managers' Emotions	24
3.1 Introduction	24
3.2 Theory and Hypotheses	26
3.2.1 Enacting negotiated i-deals: The role of managers' emotions	26
3.2.2 Employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours and managers' emotions	28
3.3 Method	30
3.3.1 Procedure and sample	30
3.3.2 Measures	31
3.3.3 Negotiation of i-deals	32
3.3.4 Attainment of i-deals	32
3.3.5 Socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following i-deal negotiations	32
3.3.6 Managers' emotions about the negotiation process	33
3.3.7 Control variables	34
3.3.8 Analytical strategy	35
3.4 Results	36
3.5 Discussion	40
3.5.1 Theoretical contributions	40
3.5.2 Practical implications	44
3.5.3 Limitations and future research directions	45
3.6 Conclusion	47
Chapter 4: A Done Deal? Differentiating between Negotiated and Obtained I-Deals	49
4.1 I-Deal Negotiations and Employees' Work Performance in the Long Term: Two Sequential Mechanisms	51

4.1.1 The role of positive emotions in linking i-deal negotiations and attainment	51
4.1.2 Attainment of i-deals and employees' work performance	52
4.2 Method.....	54
4.2.1 Procedure and sample.....	54
4.2.2 Measures.....	56
4.2.3 Analytical strategy.....	58
4.3 Results	59
4.4 Discussion	63
4.4.1 Theoretical contributions.....	64
4.4.2 Practical implications	68
4.5 Limitations and Directions for Future Research	68
Chapter 5: The Downside of HR Differentiation: Exploring the Effects of Employee Non-Entitlement to Flexitime.....	71
5.1 Theoretical Overview and Development of Hypotheses.....	73
5.1.1 Non-entitlement to flexitime and affective commitment	73
5.1.2 A closer look at the overall fairness perception	74
5.1.3 The moderating role of normativeness of flexitime	75
5.2 Method.....	77
5.2.1 Research context and sample.....	77
5.2.2 Measures.....	78
5.2.3 Analysis strategy	79
5.3 Results	80
5.3.1 Preliminary analyses.....	80
5.3.2 Hypothesis testing	81
5.4 Discussion	84
5.5 Limitations and Future Suggestions	87

5.6 Practical Implications	88
5.7 Conclusion.....	89
Chapter 6: General Discussion	90
6.1 Theoretical Contributions.....	90
6.1.1 Exploring the effects of HR differentiation from recipients' perspectives	90
6.1.2 Exploring the effects of HR differentiation from non-recipients' perspectives	96
6.2 General Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	97
6.3 Methodological Strengths and Weaknesses.....	99
6.4 Practical Implications	101
6.5 Summary and Conclusion.....	102
Bibliography	104
Publications and Presentations Arising out of this Thesis	136
Journal Papers.....	136
Conference Presentations	136
Appendix 1: Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Employee- and Workplace- Level Control Variables	138

List of Figures

Figure 1: Conceptual model	26
Figure 2: Conceptual model	51
Figure 3: Conceptual framework of the study	73
Figure 4: Moderation of normativeness of flexitime on association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness	83

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of the research focus and design adopted in each study	5
Table 2: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations	37
Table 3: Multilevel estimates for the interaction between managers' emotions about the process and the extent of successful negotiation predicting the extent of attainment of i-deals	38
Table 4: Multilevel regression analyses for employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours and managers' emotions about recent i-deal negotiations	40
Table 5: Means, standard deviations and correlations.....	59
Table 6: Multi-level regression results for the effects of i-deal negotiations on employees' emotions, attainment of i-deals and work performance.....	63
Table 7: Means, standard deviations and correlations.....	80
Table 8: Associations between non-entitlement to flexitime, overall fairness and affective commitment.....	82
Table 9: Moderation of normativeness of flexitime on association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness	83

Declaration on Inclusion of Material from a Prior Thesis

This thesis is the personal work of Yasin Rofcanin. The thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of PhD at the University of Warwick. The thesis has not been submitted for a degree at any other university.

Abstract

This thesis presents three studies which explore the effects of individualized human resource management (HRM) practices from recipients' and non-recipients' perspectives. The first two studies, focusing on the concept of idiosyncratic deals (i-deals), investigate the role of managers' emotions and employees' behaviours in translating negotiated i-deals into attainment (Study 1), and how obtained i-deals influence recipients' work performance positively in the long term (Study 2). In delineating how individualized HRM practices unfold for their recipients, the concept of i-deals is challenged.

The third study explores the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime on employees' overall perceptions of fairness, which in turn shape their affective commitment toward the organization. This study also introduces a contextual condition – the normativeness of flexitime – to understand under what conditions the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness perceptions is stronger or weaker. A quantitative methodology is adopted across the three studies. The first two studies draw on two-wave, multi-source data collected in Istanbul, Turkey. The third study is based on the Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS, 2011). This thesis makes important theoretical contributions to research on i-deals, flexitime and, more broadly, to individualized HRM. As a practical implication, this thesis underlines that caution is needed when differentiating certain HR practices for a select group of employees.

List of Abbreviations

CFA	Confirmatory factor analysis
CFI	Comparative fit index
CMB	Common method bias
df	Degrees of freedom
FWP	Flexible work practice
HPHR	High performance human resource
HPWP	High-performance work practice
HPWS	High-performance work system
HRM	Human resource management
I-deal	Idiosyncratic deal
ICC	Intraclass correlation
IPO	Initial public offering
LMX	Leader–member exchange
MCMAM	Monte Carlo Method for Assessing Mediation
RMSEA	Root mean square error of approximation
SD	Standard deviation
SRMR	Standardised root mean square residual
TLI	Tucker-Lewis index

HR DIFFERENTIATION: A DOUBLE EDGED SWORD?

Chapter 1: Introduction

Human resource (HR) practices are increasingly being differentiated by organizations, partly because of global developments such as the information economy and workplace democratization (Bal, van Kleef & Jansen, 2015; Taskin & Devos, 2005), and partly to meet the career preferences of employees who are seeking to be treated as individuals (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015; Lawler & Finegold, 2000). The differentiation approach differs from the standardization approach of traditional HRM (Kinnie et al., 2005), and the goal of this thesis is to understand its effects from the perspectives of both recipients and non-recipients.

One way in which HR differentiation may be enacted in organizations is by providing employees with idiosyncratic deals (i-deals): individually negotiated work arrangements between employee and manager (Rousseau, 2005). I-deals are individualized to address employees' unique work needs and preferences, hence differentiating them from co-workers' existing working conditions (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). I-deals involve providing employees with training and development opportunities at work, known as task and work responsibility i-deals, as well as flexibility regarding where and when work can be completed and in employees' financial packages, referred to as flexibility i-deals (Rosen et al., 2013). A growing body of research has sought to understand the effects of i-deal negotiations on focal employees' work-related behaviours and attitudes (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016). These studies reveal that i-deal negotiations tend to benefit focal employees in terms of increasing their commitment and job satisfaction (Anand et al., 2010), as well as enhancing their work performance (Ng & Feldman, 2012). However, how and why i-deal negotiations tend to benefit employees is still unclear, and theory on i-deals has been challenged.

A first challenge is that studies of i-deals have been based on an assumption that what is negotiated is automatically obtained, overlooking the possibility that some negotiated i-deals may not materialize. This view is limited, as it ignores the

conceptual and empirical distinction between the negotiation and aftermath of i-deals, and hence fails to account for whether the negotiation or acquisition of i-deals really leads to employees' positive behaviours and attitudes.

A second major challenge facing the i-deals literature is that studies have exclusively emphasized the focal employee (e.g. Ng & Feldman, 2012), without paying attention to the social context surrounding i-deals, namely managers responsible for providing i-deals to focal employees. Furthermore, the basis on which managers facilitate the provision of i-deals to employees is still unclear (e.g. Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2009). With the exception of a few recent studies that discuss the role of motives and intentions in employees' requests for i-deals (Bal & Lub, 2015; Bal & Rousseau, 2016), there is as yet a lack of research delineating the kind of employee behaviours influencing managers' decisions to facilitate the provision of i-deals to employees.

In order to address these challenges and to understand how a particular type of HR differentiation affects its recipients, two studies have been carried out. With regard to differentiating between the negotiation and implementation of i-deals, Study 1 focuses on the aftermath of i-deal negotiations and explores the role of managers in facilitating negotiated i-deals for focal employees. The main argument of this study is that managers are likely to react positively to the i-deal negotiation process of employees who engage in socially-connecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations. Conversely, managers are likely to react negatively to the i-deal negotiation process of employees who engage in socially-disconnecting behaviours following i-deal negotiations. How managers feel about employees' behaviours may determine the extent to which successfully negotiated i-deals are implemented. Goal congruence theory (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001) and the affective-consistency perspective of emotions (Yu, 2009) are used as overarching frameworks.

With regard to differentiating, both empirically and conceptually, between the negotiation and implementation of i-deals, Study 2 aims to delineate how and why negotiated i-deals are likely to relate to the work performance of employees in the long term. This study introduces two sequential mechanisms that explain the association between the negotiation of i-deals and employees' work performance,

namely employees' positive emotions and the attainment of i-deals. The main argument of Study 2 is that it is not the negotiation of i-deals *per se*, but their attainment that is positively associated with the work performance of employees in the long term. Furthermore, in order to examine how negotiated i-deals are obtained, this study explores the role of employees' positive emotions as lynchpins between negotiated and obtained i-deals. Signaling theory (Spence, 1973) is used as an overarching theoretical framework for this study.

Studies 1 and 2 focus on the effects of HR differentiation from the recipient's perspective. In order to explore the reverse of the coin, Study 3 explores how non-entitlement to a particular type of HR differentiation practice influences employees' overall fairness perceptions and their affective commitment toward the organization. By definition, HR differentiation involves implementing existing HR practices differentially for a select group of employees. This differentiation has potentially important implications for co-workers who are not given access to the same practices in a workplace, especially where there is differentiation. Despite this acknowledgment, studies to date have focused mainly on the effects of HR differentiation from the perspective of recipients, revealing only their benefits for those who are entitled to such practices (Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013). Since HR differentiation involves the distribution of valuable resources to a certain group of employees (Clinton & Guest, 2013), it may create perceptions of unfairness among employees who are not entitled to the same practices. Despite its relevance, non-entitlement to certain HR practices and the potential effects of such differentiation on non-entitled employees' fairness perceptions and outcomes have not previously been examined in this research stream. Addressing this gap is important because HR differentiation may be a double-edged sword, and fairness is likely to be an important mechanism in understanding why employees who are excluded from certain HR practices are likely to react negatively, for example with lower loyalty to the organization (e.g. Golden, 2007).

Moreover, research on HR differentiation has treated social context as invariant. However, the extent to which such differentiation prevails in workplaces may influence the extent to which employees who are excluded from such practices perceive their own treatment as unfair (Gajendran & Joshi, 2012; Golden & Veiga,

2006). It is possible that in workplaces where HR differentiation prevails, non-entitled employees will feel singled out and, as a result, react more negatively to their lack of entitlement than in workplaces where HR differentiation is less prevalent.

To tackle this limitation, Study 3 focuses on the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime (a particular form of HR practice), and explores the role of employees' overall fairness perceptions to understand why non-entitlement to flexitime may negatively influence these employees' affective commitment toward the organization. This study also introduces the concept of the normativeness of flexitime in a given workplace as a boundary condition influencing the proposed associations. Normativeness of flexitime refers to the degree to which flexitime is a prevalent practice in a workplace. Gajendran, Harrison and Delaney-Klinger's (2015) study uses the same concept. Where flexitime is a norm (the percentage of employees who are entitled to it is high), non-entitled employees may perceive their own treatment as more unfair, leading to stronger negative reactions in the form of reduced affective commitment. Study 3 draws on fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001) as an overarching framework. See Table 1 for an overview of the focus and design of each study.

Taking the three studies together, this thesis contributes to research on HR differentiation by exploring how the potential benefits of a form of differentiated HR practice (i-deals) unfolds for its recipients, the role of managers in materializing these deals and the kind of employee behaviours that influence managers' decisions in facilitating the implementation of negotiated i-deals. In viewing the effects through recipients' eyes, the concepts and underlying assumptions of i-deals are examined in greater depth.

Turning to the effects of HR differentiation from a non-recipient's perspective, this thesis emphasizes the role of overall fairness perceptions in explaining how and why employees who are not entitled to a form of differentiated HR practice may react negatively (Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013). Moreover, this study emphasizes the role of social context in understanding why some employees may perceive their treatment to be more unfair and react more negatively than others.

The prevalence of HR differentiation is conceptualized and analyzed rigorously to explore this argument in depth.

Table 1: Summary of the research focus and design adopted in each study

Study Name	Research Focus	Design
Study 1: What seals the i-deal? Exploring the role of employee behaviours and managers' emotional responses	<p>The role of managers' emotions in translating negotiated i-deals into attainment.</p> <p>The role of employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours in influencing managers' emotions.</p>	A two-wave, multi-source study design, Istanbul, Turkey.
Study 2: A done deal? Differentiation between negotiation and attainment of i-deals	<p>Conceptual distinction between negotiation and attainment of i-deals.</p> <p>The role of employees' positive emotions and attainment of i-deals as two sequential mechanisms explaining how negotiated i-deals influence work performance in the long run.</p>	A two-wave, multi-source study design, Istanbul, Turkey.
Study 3: The downside of HR differentiation: Exploring the effects of employee non-entitlement to flexitime	<p>The role of employees' overall perceptions of fairness as a mechanism explaining the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime on affective commitment to the organization.</p> <p>Normativeness of flexitime as a boundary condition influencing the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness perceptions.</p>	The employee–employer matched British Workplace Employment Relations Survey 2011 (WERS, 2011)

In contemporary business environments, where HR differentiation is becoming ever more prevalent (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015), the findings of this dissertation will inform an emergent line of research on HR differentiation, including contingency approaches to HR practices (e.g. Guest, 2011) and career customization (Benko & Weisberg, 2007), and will highlight important implications for practitioners planning to adopt different HR practices for a select group of employees within and across organizations.

This thesis has six chapters. Chapter 2 presents a literature review. First, research on widely-accepted approaches to the effects and implementation of HRM is discussed. The dynamic nature of business environments and recent research indicate a tendency toward HR differentiation, which is also discussed. The second part of the literature review examines differentiated HR practices. Rather than providing a detailed review, aspects of i-deals research that remain unresolved and that have informed Studies 1 and 2 are presented and evaluated. The third part of Chapter 2 introduces and discusses the fairness perspective on differentiated HR practices in relation to flexitime, which forms the basis of Study 3. The role of social context, namely the normativeness of flexitime and its implications, are also briefly discussed. This chapter also includes a brief discussion of the theoretical framework of each of the three studies.

Chapter 3 presents Study 1, which explores the aftermath of i-deal negotiations and investigates the relationship between employees' behaviours following i-deal negotiations, and managers' emotions in facilitating their implementation.

Chapter 4 presents Study 2, which explores the mechanisms through which the negotiation (rather than implementation) of i-deals influences employees' work performance. This study introduces employees' positive emotions and attainment of i-deals as two sequential mechanisms to explain how and why negotiated i-deals are positively related to employees' work performance in the long term.

Chapter 5 presents Study 3, which focuses on the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime in workplaces where there is differentiation, and explores how it influences employees' overall fairness perceptions and affective commitment. This study also investigates the role of normativeness of flexitime as a boundary condition that influences the effects of non-entitlement on employees' overall fairness perceptions, as well as on their affective commitment.

Finally, Chapter 6 provides a general discussion, and integrates the theory and empirical studies discussed and developed in previous chapters. This chapter highlights the theoretical and practical contributions of this thesis to research on HR differentiation, and outlines limitations and future research avenues not previously discussed in each separate study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter introduces and examines previous research on which the three studies in this dissertation are based. In the next section, commonly observed approaches to the implementation of HR practices are discussed, providing an overview of the transition from a universalistic to an individualized approach to the implementation of HR practices. The second section describes the individualization of HR practices, with a focus on idiosyncratic deals (i-deals). The current state of knowledge on i-deals is critically evaluated in relation to the content of Studies 1 and 2. Next, differentiation of HR practices is discussed from a fairness perspective, and the concept of flexitime, which is the central theme of Study 3, is elaborated on in relation to fairness and the social context of workplaces where flexitime differentiation is observed.

2.1 Research Approaches to the Implementation and Effects of HR Practices

Researchers in the field of strategic HR management have adopted three dominant perspectives: universalistic, contingency and configurational approaches.

2.1.1 Universalistic approach to HRM

The universalistic approach is built on the assumption that standardized HR practices within an organization or across groups of employees have universal effects on organizational performance, irrespective of the context (Boxall & Purcell, 2008; Kinnie et al., 2005). Often referred to as the “best practice” or “high commitment” approach, the universalistic approach has long been held to be self-evident because, from an employee perspective, standardization triggers trust in employees, and from an employer perspective, standardization saves costs (Greenberg et al., 2004). In support of the universalistic approach, many studies have revealed a positive relationship between standardized HR practices and important indicators of organizational performance (e.g. Delery & Doty, 1996; Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000; Terpstra & Rozell, 1993) and employee outcomes (Terpstra & Rozell, 1993). However, this approach has been criticized mainly for failing to consider the context in which HR practices are implemented (Takeuchi, Chen & Lepak, 2009). This criticism has led to the development of the configurational and contingency approaches.

2.1.2 Configurational approach

The central tenet of the configurational approach is that, for an HR practice to be effective, it must be combined with other HR practices to yield best performance at the organizational level. Terms such as “horizontal fit”, “internal fit”, “complementarity” and “bundling” are used by researchers who take this approach (Baird & Meshoulam 1988; Wright & McMahan 1992). As employees are exposed to more than one HR practice in an organization, the effectiveness of any practice depends on its fit or misfit with other practices in the HR system or architecture (Delery, 1998). Two defining elements of the configurational approach are synergy and alignment. Synergy suggests that the result of the HR bundle as a whole is greater and more beneficial than the sum of the separate HR practices. This occurs when the practices of the bundle have “horizontal fit”, designed in such a way that they are complement each other (Delery, 1998; Jiang et al., 2012). Alignment is the extent to which the HR bundle relates to the strategic goals of the organization, or vertical fit (Gerhart, 2007). The concept of alignment may lead to differentiation of HR practices within organizations, since organizations may consist of sub-units with different strategic goals.

Previous research has identified the benefits of aligning HR practices. For example, Pil and MacDuffie (1996) show that organizations that have complementary HR practices, such as selective hiring and use of incentives, are more likely to use high-involvement work practices. Along the same lines, Ichniowski, Shaw and Prennushi (1997) and MacDuffie (1995) show that HR practices introduced as a system have a greater impact on company productivity than single practices. In one of the most well-known studies of the configurational approach, Huselid (1995) shows that a system of HR practices, which he labels “high performance work systems” (HPWS), is positively and significantly associated with organizational outcomes. A common thread in all but a few studies that have adopted universalistic and configurational approaches is that employees in an organization are provided with a standard and universal configuration of HR practices (for exceptions, see Huselid, 1995; Jackson & Schuler, 1995).

2.1.3 Contingency approach

In contrast to the above approaches, recent studies have acknowledged that universalistic HR practices or configurations will be effective only under certain conditions. The core argument of the contingency approach is that organizations should design HR systems and implement HR practices that encourage behaviours aligned with organizational contingencies (Jackson, Schuler & Rivero, 1989). Studies adopting this approach have identified, among many other factors, industry (Osterman, 1994; Lepak & Snell, 1999, 2002), structure (Toh, Morgeson & Campion, 2008), business strategy (Hoque, 1999) and technology (Datta, Guthrie & Wright 2005) as important contingency conditions influencing the effects of single or bundled HR practices on organizational performance.

2.1.4 Beyond the contingency approach: Differentiation of HR practices

The approaches to strategic HR management discussed above focus on associations between HR practices (either in isolation or in bundles) and performance at the organizational level. However, recent trends in HRM have shifted the focus to the individual (Oyserman, Coon & Kimmelmeier, 2002) and have introduced a perspective based on individual rather than organizational needs and preferences (Kinnie et al., 2005). Going beyond the focus on organizational level performance, a few recent studies have started to explore the macro effects of HR practices on employees' attitudes and work outcomes. A study by Takeuchi et al. (2009) reveals that establishment-level, high-performance work practices (HPWPs) are positively associated with employees' job satisfaction and affective commitment through establishment-level concern for a supportive climate. Kehoe and Wright (2013) explore whether group-level high performance human resource (HPHR) practices are positively related to employees' citizenship behaviours and intentions to stay in the organization through affective commitment. Snape and Redman (2010) demonstrate that HRM practices conceptualized at the workplace level are positively related to employees' attitudes and behaviours through perceived organizational support and job influence. Bal, Kooij and De Jong (2013) reveal that accommodative HR practices measured at group level are positively related to employees' affective commitment for those with high selection and compensation needs, and negatively related to employees' work engagement for those with low selection and compensation needs. Finally, a study by Korff, Biemann and Voelpel

(2016) reveals positive effects of growth-enhancing and maintenance-enhancing HR practices on employees' affective commitment and in-role performance.

These studies adopt a multi-level approach to HRM and propose that the effects of HR practices are intended to be similar across all employees, at least at the level of job group or department. However, this approach to the implementation of HR practices overlooks the unique work needs and preferences of employees. Addressing this gap is important because, in order for HR practices to be effective, they must be consistent not only with certain aspects of the organization at macro level such as its strategy, or at meso level such as the value of human capital at team or department level, but also with micro elements such as employees' preferences and needs (Arthur & Boyles, 2007; Bal, Kooij & De Jong, 2013; Delery & Doty, 1996).

Developments such as the transition to an information economy, the democratization of workplaces and the declining trend for collective bargaining all point to the rise of individualism within and across organizations (Kaufman & Miller, 2011). Coupled with a changing workforce who (a) are diverse in terms of age, gender and ethnicity, resulting in different needs and preferences in the workplace, (b) seek to be treated as individuals, and (c) care about their individual needs and preferences (Gubler, Arnold & Coombs, 2014), individualizing and differentiating HR practices is becoming a strategic priority for organizations (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015). These developments and trends culminate in differentiation in the implementation of certain HR practices, which is referred to as HR differentiation (Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013) or variation in HR practices (Clinton & Guest, 2013). One way of differentiating HR practices is to provide employees with individually negotiated work arrangements that fit their unique work needs and preferences and are different from what co-workers already have. This practice has been termed "idiosyncratic deals", or i-deals (Rousseau, 2005).

2.2 Differentiated HR Practices

2.2.1 Concept of idiosyncratic deals

In contemporary organizational settings, individualization of work conditions is becoming increasingly pervasive. In contrast to HR practices that apply to everyone in standard ways, individualization of work practices is a trend in which employees

seek to secure working arrangements that meet their unique work needs and preferences (Call, Nyberg & Thatcher, 2015). Inspired by this trend, a growing body of research has explored the concept of i-deals (Rousseau, 2005, p.23), which refers to “voluntary, personalized agreements of a non-standard nature negotiated between individual employees and their employers regarding terms that benefit each party”. I-deals may take the form of providing training, development and career growth opportunities (task and work responsibility i-deals), flexibility regarding when and where work is carried out (schedule flexibilities) or personalized financial package deals (Rosen et al., 2013). They may be negotiated before recruitment (*ex ante* i-deals) or following recruitment (*ex post* i-deals).

2.2.2 Related constructs

I-deals are similar to psychological contracts, in that both focus on employment relationships between employee and employer (Rousseau, 2005). However, there is an important distinction between the two: psychological contracts refer to employees’ informal beliefs regarding their mutual obligations with their employers (Rousseau, 1995) and are implicit in nature, whereas i-deals involve explicit negotiations on employment conditions (Ng & Feldman, 2010). In light of this distinction, it is argued that i-deals may lead employees to develop distinct psychological contracts, or that employees’ pursuit of i-deals may be influenced by their existing psychological contracts (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). Therefore, it may be argued that psychological contracts and i-deals are distinct, yet influence each other.

Rousseau (2005) suggests that i-deals differ from preferential treatment or cynicism in a number of respects. A first defining element of i-deals is that they should be mutually beneficial to the employee and the organization. For example, it is expected that employees who are granted i-deals will be motivated and show better work performance (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2008). Another feature of i-deals is their explicit nature, as they are often public rather than inherently secret, under-the-table deals (Lai, Rousseau & Chang, 2009; Greenberg et al., 2004). The explicit nature of i-deals is suggested to differentiate them from preferential agreements.

2.2.3 Measurement issues

Measurement of i-deals has been problematic and confounded in the research to date. Studies have measured the negotiation of i-deals, but appear to have assumed that what is negotiated is automatically obtained. There are many reasons why negotiation may not lead smoothly to attainment of i-deals (for example, changes in HR policy, restrictions in HR resources or the inability of the manager to provide the negotiated i-deals to the focal employee) and, indeed, they may fail to be implemented at all. Therefore, empirical and conceptual differentiation between negotiation and attainment remains unresolved (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015).

In i-deals research, the most commonly used scale is that developed by Rousseau, Ho and Greenberg (2006). A major limitation of this scale is that it asks respondents to indicate the extent to which “they have asked for and successfully negotiated individual arrangements different from their peers” (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2008, p.659; Ng & Feldman, 2016, p.13; Rousseau & Kim, 2006, p.13). This measurement approach may be problematic, because both employees who have not asked for anything and employees who have asked unsuccessfully are likely to score 1 on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (to a very great extent). One way to address this limitation is to differentiate between groups of respondents who “negotiated”, who “did not ask for” and who “asked for and successfully obtained” i-deals, as these three groups of people are likely to have different characteristics.

The most recent scale is that developed by Rosen et al. (2013), conceptualizing i-deals as being composed of task and work responsibility i-deals, financial i-deals and schedule i-deals. One advantage of this scale is that the authors followed conventional scale development procedures and differentiated between the sub-dimensions of i-deals. However, some of the problems found in the measures used in previous research are also found in this scale. First, five (out of sixteen) items of the scale focus on the negotiation of i-deals, while the rest focus on their attainment, confounding the difference between negotiation and attainment of i-deals. Second, employees are asked to state the extent to which they successfully asked for i-deals that are different from what their co-workers already had, which is challenging to answer. In order to show that negotiation and attainment of i-deals are empirically

different from each other, the current study separates negotiation from attainment of i-deals and measures their effects on employees' work performance with a time lag of six months.

2.2.4 Theoretical frameworks

Since the concept of i-deals was first introduced in the literature (Rousseau, 2005), researchers have shown a steady interest in this topic. The dominant theoretical framework for i-deals research has been social exchange theory, namely the norm of reciprocity. Initial studies have built on the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) to explain that i-deals constitute the basis for exchange relationships between employees and employers. The core assumption has been that, through granting i-deals to employees, organizations expect to strengthen their relationships with employees, which leads employees to feel indebted to the organization and willing to pay back the favourable treatment with desirable behaviours and attitudes (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2008). Accordingly, studies based on the norm of reciprocity reveal that i-deal negotiations are positively associated with organizational commitment (Rosen et al., 2013), constructive voice (Ng & Feldman, 2012) and organizational citizenship behaviours (Anand et al., 2010).

A second theoretical perspective is the self-enhancement role of i-deals, which is proposed and empirically tested by Liu et al. (2013). Going beyond the effects of reciprocity, their study shows that i-deals may contribute to employees' self-enhancement at work by providing them with training, development and career growth opportunities. Self-enhancement, in turn, is found to relate to proactive behaviours. No other study has explored the concept of i-deals from a self-enhancement perspective.

Another theoretical framework is signalling theory (Spence, 1973), which proposes that granting i-deals to employees signals organizations' good intentions; in other words, employees are valued and therefore are worth providing with i-deals. Similarly, Ho and Kong (2015) show that task-related i-deals satisfy employees' competence needs, leading to discretionary or organizational citizenship behaviours. Building on the signalling functions of i-deals, Bal and Dorenbosch (2015) reveal that individualized HR practices, conceptualized as i-deals, relate

positively to companies' performance growth and negatively to employees' leaving intentions.

The fourth theoretical perspective is work adjustment theory (Baltes et al., 1999), which proposes that by obtaining i-deals, employees are able to achieve a fit between their personalized work needs and what their jobs offer. Hence, i-deals may serve to balance the demands of work and non-work lives, enabling employees to achieve a better work-life balance (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). In support of this, studies have shown that i-deals relate to greater motivation to work beyond retirement (Bal et al., 2012) and reduced work-family conflict (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2008). In adopting these various theoretical perspectives, research has started to show that i-deals are potentially beneficial for employee performance and attitudes.

Finally, studies have started to integrate i-deals with the psychological contract literature. For example, Ng & Feldman (2008) refer to the uniqueness of psychological contracts in discussing the concept of i-deals. They argue that i-deals create contract idiosyncrasy and constitute a specific element of psychological contracts. Furthermore, they emphasize that psychological contract uniqueness is important in understanding how a focal employee obtains i-deals (Ng & Feldman, 2012). The idea that employees form unique psychological contracts in the process of i-deal making is also emphasized in more recent studies (Guerrero, Bentein & Lapalme, 2014; Guerrero and Bentein, 2015; Kroon, Freese & Schalk, 2015).

However, as delineated in a recent meta-analysis (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016), some results relating to the effects of i-deal negotiations are inconsistent. For instance, Rosen et al.'s (2013) study, in which four different i-deal dimensions are developed (task and work responsibilities, and financial, location and schedule flexibility), finds that only task and work responsibility i-deals are consistently positively associated with employees' attitudes (job satisfaction and affective commitment), while other types of i-deal are not consistently related to work outcomes. Moreover, Bal et al. (2012) reveal that relationships between developmental i-deals and work motivation depend on unit climate, indicating a contingent nature of i-deals in predicting work outcomes. In the research to date, it has been assumed that what is negotiated is automatically obtained. The

measurement issues in previous research, as well as inconsistent or weak findings regarding the effects of i-deal negotiations on employees' work outcomes, underline that i-deals do not end with negotiation, and that there is a need to focus on what happens thereafter.

2.2.5 Disentangling negotiation and attainment of i-deals

I-deals are explicitly negotiated between an employee and a manager (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016). Negotiation refers to bargaining over work demands which are subsequently worked out into a solution (Reif & Brodbeck, 2014). In this sense, i-deals may be considered as comprising at least two steps: negotiation followed by attainment.

I-deal negotiations are typically initiated by employees, and decisions to grant them are made by their managers (Rousseau, 2006). Employees take the first step to modify their current working arrangements by approaching their managers to ask for i-deals. Employees may negotiate i-deals before being recruited, during the process of being hired. Employees' *ex ante* i-deal negotiations may depend largely on their market value, whereas *ex post* i-deal negotiations are heavily shaped by employers' willingness to modify existing employment relationships. As discussed in previous sections, research to date has focused predominantly on i-deal negotiations, and has paid little attention to the aftermath.

Successful negotiation of i-deals does not automatically lead to their smooth implementation. Factors that influence the transition of i-deal negotiations into attainment involve primarily managers, who play a crucial role in materializing i-deals (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2009). Managers are expected to juggle the interests of the employee requesting the i-deal, the team and the organization. If i-deals are likely to disrupt the flow of work in a team, managers are less likely to be supportive (Bal, van Kleef & Jansen, 2015). While many other factors may influence the transition of negotiated i-deals into attainment, such as organizational policies, practices and resources, the focus of this dissertation is on managers, who are the primarily targeted parties in i-deal negotiations and who have the power to materialize the negotiated i-deals of their subordinates.

In summary, i-deals may be considered as a process consisting of at least two stages: negotiation and attainment. The literature has focused predominantly on the former,

whereas the latter is crucial in exploring the intended benefits of i-deals for employees and other stakeholders. Studies 1 and 2 deal with this gap by differentiating conceptually and empirically between negotiation and attainment of i-deals.

2.2.6 Theoretical framework of Study 1

Study 1 integrates the affective-consistency perspective of emotions (Yu, 2009) with goal congruence theory to explain the role of managers' emotions in facilitating the provision of negotiated i-deals to employees. According to this perspective, individuals are motivated to maintain consistency between various attributes of the self, including their emotions, behaviours and attitudes (Seong & Choi, 2014). From this angle, emotions can be considered as cognitive-filters, leading to affect-consistent behaviours and attitudes (Yu, 2009). Adopting this perspective, if managers feel positive about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations, they are likely to facilitate the implementation of negotiated i-deals, whereas if they feel negative about the most recent i-deal negotiation process, they may be unlikely to facilitate the attainment of i-deals.

To explore what influences how managers feel about the most recent i-deal negotiation process of employees, Study 1 integrates goal-congruence theory (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001). This theory argues that correspondence between one's own goals and those of others influences one's subsequent behaviours, attitudes and reactions (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001). In the context of i-deals, managers' ultimate goal in facilitating the provision of i-deals is to ensure that these arrangements contribute to team effectiveness and functioning. One way for managers to understand whether employees' goals in requesting i-deals are in line with those of managers is to observe their behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations. Managers are likely to feel positive about employees' socially connecting behaviours, such as sharing or helping co-workers, and negative about employees' socially disconnecting behaviours, such as avoiding interactions with co-workers, following their most recent i-deal negotiations.

Study 1 focuses on the aftermath of successful i-deal negotiations and explores the role of managers in translating negotiated i-deals into attainment. In particular, it provides a complete picture of i-deals by examining the interplay between

employees' behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiation and managers' emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiation processes. The approach in Study 1 complements i-deals research by including both the employee and the manager in this process, and hence goes beyond previous research which has overlooked the social context in which i-deals unfold.

2.2.7 Theoretical framework of Study 2

Study 2 builds on signalling theory (Spence, 1973) to delineate two mechanisms – employees' positive emotions and the attainment of i-deals – relevant to understanding how and why negotiated i-deals may or may not relate to employees' work performance in the long term. The signalling function of i-deals has been emphasized in recent research (Ho & Kong, 2015), which has argued that i-deals signal the benevolent intentions of the employer to the employee (Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006). According to signalling theory, the signaller (employer) conveys certain messages to the receiver (employee) in the hope of eliciting positive behaviours favourable to both parties (Belogolovsky & Bamberger, 2014). The effectiveness of signalling depends on the extent to which the intentions of the signaller are interpreted accurately by the receiver (Ho & Kong, 2015) and the extent to which the signaller is consistent in his or her actions in the long term (Connelly et al., 2011).

Negotiation of an i-deal acts as an intent signal for the focal employee, suggesting that the employer is willing to grant the i-deal. Employees' positive emotions following i-deal negotiations signal that they have interpreted the intentions of employers accurately, and they are likely to remain positive until the negotiated i-deals are obtained. However, it is the actual attainment of i-deals, beyond negotiation, that signals the consistency of the employer's actions, and hence enhances the effectiveness of signalling, boosting employees' work performance. This literature review sheds light on the weak and inconsistent findings of previous research regarding the effects of i-deal negotiations on employees' work performance, and emphasizes the overlooked role of employees' affective states as a lynchpin to explain how and why negotiated i-deals are obtained in the long term.

Overall, Studies 1 and 2 explore the effects of i-deals on their recipients and, in so doing, delineate the role of employee behaviours, managers' emotions (Study 1),

employees' positive emotions and the attainment of i-deals (Study 2) to understand how negotiated i-deals are materialized in the long term. Unlike these two studies, Study 3 focuses on the effects of flexitime, a form of HR practice, through the eyes of non-recipients.

2.3 Role of Fairness Perceptions and Social Context in Differentiated HR Practices

2.3.1 Concept of flexitime

In exploring the effects of a differentiated HR practice from the perspective of employees who are not entitled to them, this study focuses on flexitime. Flexitime refers to variations in the timing of work conducted during a day (Kossek & Lee, 2008). While standard work hours have previously been the norm in organizations, a growing number are implementing flexitime schedules (Thompson, Payne & Taylor, 2015). The increasing prevalence of flexitime is observed across the globe, including in the USA and the UK: national country studies in the USA, UK and Australia show that fewer than half of employees work to a standard work schedule (Golden, 2008; Watson et al., 2003). Therefore, it is a prevalent HR practice that aims to increase efficiency, motivation and productivity by providing employees with the discretion to self-manage their work (Kossek & Lee, 2008).

The unprecedented growth of flexitime across organizations can be explained by recent demographic labour market shifts, which have given rise to an employment market that increasingly values flexible work schedules (Kossek & Michel, 2016). As the need to manage family responsibilities while also working grows, the need for flexitime has also increased (Thompson, Payne & Taylor, 2015). Dual-earner families and caregiving for the elderly are among the trends reflecting labour market shifts that explain the growth in demand for flexitime. There is also growing evidence showing that a new generation of employees who have just entered the workforce also value work-life balance, and hence value flexible work schedules (Kossek & Michel, 2016).

In support of the effects of flexitime, an increasing number of studies has shown its positive effects for employees who benefit from it. Greater satisfaction with work schedules (Baltes et al., 1999), lower absenteeism (Dalton & Mesch, 1990), decreased turnover (Stavrou, 2005), lower work-family conflict (Byron, 2005),

perceptions of greater organizational support for families and job satisfaction (Allen, 2001), and decreases in negative affect for women caregivers (Chesley & Moen, 2006) are among the reported impacts on employees. A recent meta-analysis of flexible work practices also shows that flexitime has a significant impact on employees' work- and non-work-related lives (Allen et al., 2013), and the same study has called for future research treating flexibilities of time and location separately. A study by Thompson, Payne and Taylor (2015) reveals similar results and shows that flexitime has a more significant effect than flexi-location on employees' perceptions of organizational support. This study also calls for flexitime and flexi-location practices to be distinguished both empirically and theoretically.

2.3.2 Effects of flexitime from a fairness perspective

For the reasons discussed above, differentiation of HR practices is suggested to be a rational strategy for organizations. However, differentiation automatically promotes inequality among employees, making it a very sensitive issue. Since differentiation of HR practices involves the distribution of valuable resources to certain employees, those who are deprived of such resources may react negatively (Paauwe, 2009). Fairness is therefore part and parcel of differentiated HR practices. Research on HR has emphasized the key role of fairness perceptions and has shown that employees' fairness perceptions play a key role in career management (Crawshaw, 2006), performance management (Farndale et al., 2011) and performance appraisals (Flint, 1999). However, research on the fairness perceptions of employees who are denied particular HR practices is lacking, which is a remarkable omission, given the role of co-workers in making these practices sustainable and effective in a team setting. In order to address calls for research to focus on certain types of flexible work practices and to explore their effects from the perspective of employees who are not entitled to them, this study focuses on the fairness perceptions of unentitled employees in order to understand why this may influence employee outcomes negatively.

The focus on flexitime is relevant in considering the implications from the perspective of non-recipients. For example, flexibility regarding the amount of work, such as reduced workload or work hours, is associated with reduced salaries

and inferior compensation packages for employees entitled to it (van Rijswijk et al., 2004). Employees not entitled to it may therefore not consider the alternative to be better than their current situation. Another type of flexibility relates to continuity of work, such as short-term breaks in employment or time off. Studies have shown that these types of flexibility are not significantly related to employees' job satisfaction (Lee & Johnson, 1991; McGinnis & Morrow, 1990), and indeed are positively associated with turnover intentions (Feldman & Doeringhaus, 1992) and reduced continuity in work (Olmsted & Smith, 1989).

With regard to the effects of flexibility regarding location, such as telecommuting, studies have produced equivocal results. Although flexi-location arrangements may have positive effects on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of employees (Allen, 2001) and on organizational performance (Stavrou, 2005), some studies reveal that they are not always positive. For example, Golden, Veiga and Simsek (2006) show that, while flexible location is associated with lower work-to-family conflict, it may give rise to higher family-to-work conflict. Lapierre and Allen (2006) demonstrate that flexible location is associated with higher time-based family-to-work conflict. It may therefore be difficult to interpret whether the absence of flexibility regarding the amount, continuity and location of work will be regarded as better by employees who are not entitled to them. Given the prevalence of flexitime in organizations across the globe and its stronger effects on employees' work and non-work lives than other types of flexibility, including flexibility in location, amount or continuity of work, the focus of Study 3 is on the former, particularly the fairness perceptions of employees who are not entitled to flexitime in workplaces where it is differentially implemented.

Research has revealed three categories of fairness: fairness regarding the distribution of outcomes, otherwise known as distributive justice (Adams, 1965), fairness regarding the procedures used to determine outcomes, known as procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975), and fairness regarding the quality of interpersonal treatment related to outcomes, known as interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986). Research has further distinguished two dimensions of interactional justice: interpersonal justice, meaning treatment reflecting respect and dignity (Bies & Moag, 1986) and informational justice, referring to the provision of adequate

explanations (Greenberg, 2001). Meta-analyses have confirmed that each justice dimension is associated with a broad range of employee attitudes and behaviours (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001).

However, a growing body of research is finding that individuals may not focus on the different dimensions of justice, but may instead use available information and form global impressions of fairness (Greenberg, 2001; Shapiro, 2001), suggesting an integrative trend in evaluating global fairness perceptions (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001). Some researchers have suggested focusing on overall fairness for several reasons. First, overall fairness may offer a more parsimonious and accurate depiction of individuals' justice experiences than individual justice dimensions (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). Second, overall fairness is a more proximal driver of employee attitudes and behaviours (Kim & Leung, 2007). Finally, overall fairness enables researchers to match the level of specificity between overall fairness and employees' global attitudes such as affective commitment and behaviours such as helping (Barclay & Kiefer, 2014). Accordingly, Study 3 focuses on the overall fairness perceptions of employees who are not entitled to flexitime.

2.3.3 Role of social context: Concept of normativeness of flexitime

Employees rely on cues in their work environment to interpret relationships and actions (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). In particular, the behaviours of managers are important sources of information enabling employees to interpret workplace actions. Accordingly, in workplaces where flexitime is implemented differentially across groups of employees, the extent to which flexitime prevails in a workplace provides relevant social information. Employees may use this information as a reference point, and evaluate whether or not an alternative course of action might have been taken by decision makers (e.g. their line managers). Employees who are part of a small workgroup that does not have access to flexitime may feel singled out. In contrast, when the proportion of employees entitled to flexitime is low in a workplace, non-entitled employees are unlikely to feel singled out. These employees are likely to interpret their lack of entitlement as the norm, and it is unlikely to influence their fairness perceptions and affective commitment negatively. To evaluate the effects of normativeness of flexitime as a social context,

in this study an objective index is calculated, reflecting the prevalence of flexitime across all workplaces.

2.3.4 Theoretical framework of Study 3

Study 3 builds on fairness theory to explore how and when non-entitlement to flexitime is likely to influence employees' overall fairness perceptions and affective commitment. As an extension of referent cognition theory (Folger, 1986), fairness theory aims to explain how individuals form overall fairness perceptions (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). In particular, by integrating distinct components of justice into a global fairness perception, fairness theory focuses on the cognitive processes through which individuals hold others responsible for certain work experiences that have negative effects on their well-being (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). The concept of accountable blame constitutes the core tenet of fairness theory, according to which (1) a negative consequence or harm needs to have occurred as a result of certain work experiences, (2) a violation to standards must have occurred, and (3) blame is attributable to the discretionary behaviours of other person(s). The combination of these conditions means that other person(s) can be held accountable for the outcome, shaping individuals' overall fairness perceptions.

According to fairness theory, individuals engage in counterfactual thinking, which involves comparing the current outcome with an alternative one which is either better or worse (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). Three counterfactuals are central to fairness theory: *would*, *could* and *should*. The *would* counterfactual is about comparing the current outcome with an alternative outcome. If the alternative appears more desirable, harm is experienced, shaping the focal individual's perceptions of overall fairness. The *could* counterfactual is about whether an alternative course of action was feasible and the decision maker had control to change the current outcome. If the decision maker could have undertaken some action to prevent the negative outcome and did not do so, the harmed individual is likely to attribute blame to the other person, perceiving him or her to be unfair (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). The *should* counterfactual addresses the formation of overall fairness by assessing whether an ethical norm has been violated by the decision maker. If the actions of the decision maker do not follow conventionally accepted norms and standards, the outcome will be seen as unfair. Overall,

individuals see certain outcomes as unfair when they feel that they would have received better outcomes if the decision maker(s) could and should have acted differently. Fairness theory suggests that it is possible for different types of counterfactual thinking to occur simultaneously in no given order.

2.4 Summary

In this chapter, aspects of the literature on HR practices as they relate to the concepts of i-deals and flexitime have been described and discussed. The three studies of this thesis are rooted in the gaps in the literature discussed in this chapter. All research activities of this thesis followed the Code of Ethics of the University of Warwick, which emphasises respect, integrity, competence and research integrity.

The next three chapters present the three studies of this thesis. Chapter 3 presents Study 1, which explores the role of employees' behaviours and managers' emotions in translating negotiated i-deals into attainment. Chapter 4 presents Study 2, which investigates two mechanisms for understanding how and why successfully negotiated i-deals may (not) relate to the work performance of employees in the long term. The two studies draw on data collected in Istanbul, Turkey. Chapter 5 presents Study 3, which explores the role of overall fairness perceptions and the normativeness of flexitime to understand how and when non-entitlement to flexitime is negatively associated with employees' affective commitment. This study draws on an existing dataset, WERS 2011 (The British Work Employment Relations Survey).

Chapter 3: What Seals the I-Deal? Exploring the Role of Employees' Behaviours and Managers' Emotions¹

3.1 Introduction

As a result of rising competition (Benko & Weisberg, 2007), dynamism in labour markets (Greenhaus, Callanan & Godshalk, 2010) and changes in employees' work preferences (Glassner & Keune, 2012; Guest & Rodrigues, 2015), organizations can no longer rely on a one-size-fits-all approach to human resource management (HRM) practices. With a decline in collective agreements for employees (De Leede, Looise & Van Riemsdijk, 2004), organizations are increasingly stressing the importance of employees taking charge of their own careers (Greenhaus, Callanan & Godshalk, 2010). Negotiating idiosyncratic deals (i-deals) is one way in which individuals can shape their careers (Anand et al., 2010; Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006).

I-deals are defined as individually negotiated agreements between a subordinate and a manager. Such deals provide benefits such as skills and capability development (task and work responsibility i-deals), and flexible location, scheduling and financial packages (flexibility i-deals) to their recipients (Rosen et al., 2013; Rousseau, Hornung & Kim, 2009). Although i-deals are negotiated between an employee and a manager, they are intended to be beneficial for the entire team (Bal & Rousseau, 2015).

Organizations use i-deals as individualized HRM practices to improve employee performance and motivation (Bal et al., 2012; Rousseau, Hornung & Kim, 2009). In line with this notion, studies have begun to demonstrate that employees who have successfully negotiated i-deals engage in positive behaviours, such as helping their colleagues (Anand et al., 2010), and experience greater affective commitment (Ng & Feldman, 2012) and job satisfaction (Hornung et al., 2010).

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the following conferences: Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2015). Sealing the deal: The role of employee motives and manager emotions in I-deals process. In T. Kiefer, N. Conway & Y. Rofcanin (Chairs), *Scrutinizing I-deals and their impact beyond the focal employee*, Symposium at the 75th Academy of Management Annual Conference, Vancouver, Canada; Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2015). What seals the I-deal? The interplay of employees' motives and managers' emotions. Paper presented at the CIPD Conference for Applied Research, the Shard, London, UK; Current Status: under second-round revision for *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*.

In the growing field of research on i-deals, studies to date have focused predominantly on the negotiation of i-deals (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2009; Ng & Feldman, 2012), overlooking the possibility that negotiated i-deals may not always be enacted (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015). With the exception of a recent study by Rofcanin, Kiefer and Strauss (2014), previous i-deals research has paid little attention to whether what is negotiated is ultimately obtained. This raises the question of “what seals the deal?” In other words, what factors shape the process of moving from successful i-deal negotiations to obtaining the negotiated i-deal?

Managers play a critical role in this process, as they often hold the power to implement the negotiated deal (Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006). Beyond addressing employees’ specific work needs, the goal of managers in honouring i-deals is to drive team effectiveness by ensuring that focal employees share the benefits of their i-deals with their co-workers (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). In line with previous research on individualized HRM practices (e.g. Farndale & Kelliher, 2013), this study argues that, in deciding whether or not to facilitate the enactment of a negotiated i-deal, managers tend to consider whether it will contribute to the functionality and cohesion of the team. From the perspective of the affective-consistency of emotions (Yu, 2009), it argues that how managers feel about their most recent i-deal negotiation process with an employee may determine the extent to which successfully negotiated i-deals will be enacted. Furthermore, in incorporating goal congruence theory (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001), it argues that managers’ emotions are shaped by the extent to which employees engage in socially connecting or disconnecting behaviours following their most recent successful i-deals negotiation. Socially connecting behaviours include helping co-workers and initiating interactions with them, while socially disconnecting behaviours involve withdrawing from co-workers and avoiding interactions with others (Kiefer & Barclay, 2012).

In exploring the aftermath of successful i-deal negotiations, this research contributes to an understanding of when negotiated i-deals are obtained, stressing the importance of managers and outlining that how managers feel about the process of employees’ most recent i-deal negotiations determines the enactment of successfully negotiated i-deals. This is in line with Rousseau’s (2005) argument

that a theoretical understanding of i-deals must encompass both recipients and granters. This exploration of the role of employees' behaviours and managers' emotions following recent i-deal negotiations also highlights whether, on receipt of i-deals, employees are likely to share the benefits with co-workers (Ng & Feldman, 2012). Figure 1 depicts the proposed conceptual model. The next section develops the hypotheses of this study.




Figure 1: Conceptual model

3.2 Theory and Hypotheses

3.2.1 Enacting negotiated i-deals: The role of managers' emotions

Research to date has built on the implicit assumption that negotiated i-deals are automatically enacted (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016), overlooking the distinction between negotiation and attainment. However, this association may be influenced by many factors and is therefore unlikely to be straightforward (Rofcanin, Kiefer & Strauss, 2014). This research focuses on managers in delineating when negotiated i-deals are put into effect.

Managers are principal agents of their organizations, communicating the willingness of organizations to support the implementation of individualized work

arrangements (Bal, van Kleef & Jansen, 2015). As a result of increasing decentralization in organizations, managers play a particularly crucial role in deciding on, modifying and implementing HR practices (e.g. Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007), such as i-deals (Farndale & Kelliher, 2013). Managers are important parties in i-deals because they are the primary targeted parties in this dyadic relationship and are likely to know about the unique work needs of employees in their team (Farndale & Kelliher, 2013); thus, they are able to ensure that negotiated deals are ultimately enacted (Rousseau, 2005). In facilitating the enactment of negotiated i-deals, managers aim to ensure that focal employees share their benefits with co-workers (Rousseau, 2005), so that such deals contribute to team efficiency and performance (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015). When managers are convinced that their goals will be met through the provision of an i-deal to a focal employee who is likely to share its benefits with co-workers, they are more likely to support that employee in obtaining the negotiated i-deal. In focusing on managers' emotions as an indication of their support for the attainment of i-deals, this study examines the role of managers' emotions in determining the extent to which successfully negotiated i-deals are enacted.

This study posits that when managers feel positive about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations, the chances of successfully negotiated i-deals being put into place increase. Research on the affective-consistency of emotions supports this argument (Yu, 2009). A key tenet of this perspective is that individuals are motivated to maintain consistency between various attributes of the self, including feelings, attitudes and behaviours. In this respect, managers' emotions may operate as cognitive filters, facilitating the development of affect-consistent behaviours and decisions (Seong & Choi, 2014; Yu, 2009). In the context of i-deals, it is expected that, if managers feel positive about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations, they will facilitate the enactment of those deals. On the other hand, if managers feel negative about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations, they will be less willing to support their attainment. Therefore, the first hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 1: Managers' emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations moderate the association between successful i-deal negotiation and attainment. This relationship is stronger when managers feel positive (H1a) and weaker when managers feel negative (H1b) about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations.

3.2.2 Employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours and managers' emotions

As argued above, managers' emotions about the process of employees' i-deal negotiations are likely to determine the extent to which negotiated i-deals are enacted, raising the question of what influences how managers feel. This study argues that employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations are likely to influence how managers feel about the negotiation process.

A key tenet of goal congruence theory (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001) is that mutuality between one's own goals and those of others positively influences one's subsequent attitudes, behaviours and emotional reactions (Seong & Choi, 2014). In the context of i-deals, a manager's goal in facilitating the provision of an i-deal to a focal employee is to ensure that the deal is beneficial to the entire team (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). For this reason, managers will try to understand how, having negotiated i-deals, employees will use them: they may either use them for their own benefit, or share the benefits with co-workers, in line with managers' ultimate goals (Mathieu et al., 2008).

One way for managers to understand employees' goals and determine whether focal employees are likely to share the benefits of i-deals with co-workers is to observe their behaviours following recent i-deal negotiations. In this regard, Hornung, Rousseau and Glaser (2009) find that managers' provision of i-deals is positively associated with their observation of employees' proactive behaviours, such as initiative taking. This is because employees who take initiatives are expected to share the benefits of i-deals with co-workers and contribute to team efficiency (Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006). Collins, Cartwright and Hislop's (2013) study demonstrates that managers provide i-deals in the form of homeworking to their subordinates as long as they are able to observe that the employees' performance

contributes to team efficiency. Research on flexible work practices (FWPs) has produced similar results: managers support and implement FWPs for focal employees if this is unlikely to disrupt team efficiency (Kossek et al., 2016; den Dulk & de Ruijter, 2008).

Building on these recent studies and turning to the role of managers, employees' socially connecting or disconnecting behaviours following recent i-deal negotiations may provide managers with information on the goals of employees requesting i-deals. Whether they share the benefits of i-deals with team members or keep the benefits to themselves consequently has an impact on managers' goal achievement.

This study identifies a positive association between employees' socially connecting behaviours following recent i-deal negotiations and managers' positive emotions about employees' most recent i-deal negotiating process. Socially connecting behaviours reflect concern for others and are characterized by self-initiated interactions by employees that involve helping, caring for and socializing with co-workers (Kiefer & Barclay, 2012). Such behaviours signal to managers that these employees are concerned about co-workers' interests and are likely to share the benefits of i-deals with them, contributing to team effectiveness. For example, facilitating the attainment of career-related i-deals for employees who are connected with and concerned about their team members may enhance team performance and contribute to team effectiveness (e.g. De Cremer, Van Dijke & Mayer, 2010). If they observe socially connecting behaviours in employees, managers may infer that those employees will share the benefits of i-deals with co-workers, which will contribute to their overall goal. Therefore, the second hypothesis of this study is:

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive association between employees' socially connecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations and managers' positive emotions about employees' most recent i-deal negotiation process.

Socially disconnecting behaviours, such as avoiding social interactions and withdrawing from co-workers, reflect social alienation from co-workers and teams (Kiefer & Barclay, 2012). Managers may react negatively to employees' socially

disconnecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations, inferring that such employees are likely to keep the benefits of i-deals to themselves, which may harm team effectiveness (e.g. Hu & Liden, 2015), and hence hamper managers' achievement of goals in providing i-deals. They will thus feel negative about the i-deal negotiation process for these employees. This leads to the third hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive association between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations and managers' negative emotions about employees' most recent negotiation process.

3.3 Method

3.3.1 Procedure and sample

The data collection for Study 1 took place between May 2013 and June 2014. Participants of Study 1 included full-time working executive MBA (EMBA) students and their managers in Istanbul, Turkey. Admission to this EMBA programme is challenging in terms of prior academic success and years of professional experience and, following graduation, EMBA students are expected to be promoted. These executives are therefore likely to take steps to advance their careers and ask for i-deals. Following the ethical approvals from the director of the EMBA programs, potential participants are selected from the registration system of the university.

As the surveys were administered in Turkish, the items were first translated into Turkish (Brislin, 1986), and their wording was then discussed with four full professors from related fields. The survey was pre-tested with twelve Turkish doctoral students in the field of organizational behaviour. Following minor adjustments, the final survey was then back-translated by a professional translator, as recommended to ensure face validity (Prieto, 1992).

Data were collected at two time points six months apart, which is considered to be a sufficient time period to investigate changes in work arrangements and employment conditions (Demerouti & Rispens, 2014) and is also in line with previous research on i-deals (Ng & Feldman, 2012). At Time 1 which started in May 2013, personalized emails were sent to 821 EMBA students, briefing them

about the study procedure and providing them with a link to an online survey. A total of 225 responses were obtained, representing a response rate of 27 per cent. A total of 17 surveys were not used because of missing data and incomplete responses. In the end, 208 surveys were used at Time 1, reflecting a response rate of 25 per cent. At Time 2 (June, 2014), a total of 148 responses were obtained from employees who participated in Time 1, reflecting a response rate of 71 per cent. Due to missing and incomplete data, only 130 surveys were used in Time 2, reflecting a response rate of 63 per cent. None of the study variables or demographic variables differed between employees who only participated at Time 1 and those who participated at both times.

When the employees had completed their surveys online, they provided their managers' contact details. The managers were then contacted by the first author of this research via email or telephone and asked to complete a paper-based questionnaire in their own offices. At Time 1, 112 were approached and due to the missing data, only 103 surveys were used from managers, providing a response rate of 92 per cent. In Time 2, 55 managers participated and due to the missing data, 46 surveys were used from managers in Time 2 (84 per cent). In the end, the final sample of Study 1 consisted of matched data for 130 employees and 46 managers. On average, one manager supervised 2.82 employees ($SD = 1.35$). The number of employees supervised by a single manager ranged from one to eight.

Among the employees who participated at both time points, 61 per cent were middle-level managers, and 39 per cent were front-line managers. Fifty-three per cent were male, and the average age was 29.2 years ($SD = 4.6$). Participants' average tenure in the organization was 3.8 years ($SD = 3.3$), and average tenure in their current role was 2.5 years ($SD = 2.7$). With regard to the managers, 67 per cent of those who participated at both time points were male, with an average age of 34.2 ($SD = 5.65$). On average, they had worked in the organization for 5.2 years ($SD = 2.3$), and in their current role for 4.3 years ($SD = 2.2$).

3.3.2 Measures

Unless otherwise indicated, items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree".

3.3.3 Negotiation of i-deals

The employees were first provided with Rousseau's (2005, p.93) definition of i-deals as "voluntary, personalized agreements of a non-standard nature negotiated between individual employees and their employers regarding terms that benefit each party". Following this definition, six items from Rosen et al.'s (2013) i-deals scale were used to measure the extent to which employees had successfully negotiated with their managers for task and work responsibility i-deals within the past six months in Time 1. An example item was "*I have successfully negotiated for tasks that better develop my skills*" ($\alpha = 0.88$).

3.3.4 Attainment of i-deals

At Time 2, employees were asked to consider the time period since the survey six months previously. The extent to which they had obtained the i-deals they had successfully negotiated at Time 1 was measured by adapting Rosen et al.'s (2013) scale. Participants who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" for any task and work responsibility i-deal negotiation items presented at Time 1 were asked to indicate to what extent they had obtained these i-deals. An example item was "*I have obtained tasks that better develop my skills*" ($\alpha = 0.87$).

3.3.5 Socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following i-deal negotiations

Employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours were treated as separate dimensions. At Time 1, socially connecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations were measured with four items adapted from Kiefer and Barclay (2012). The original items measured employees' socially disconnecting behaviours, and these were therefore re-worded to capture employees' socially connecting behaviours. Participants rated the extent to which they had helped co-workers or initiated social interactions with them following their most recently negotiated i-deals. An example item was "*I connected with my co-workers*" ($\alpha = 0.88$).

Four items from Kiefer and Barclay (2012) were used at Time 1 to measure the extent to which employees had engaged in socially disconnecting behaviours following their most recently negotiated i-deals, such as withdrawing from or ignoring others. An example was "*I isolated myself*" ($\alpha = 0.88$).

To ensure that employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations were distinct, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using AMOS 19.0 with maximum likelihood estimation (Byrne, 2001). Hu and Bentler's (1999) suggested procedures and cut-off values were used. A one-factor model displayed poor fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 334.86$, $df = 20$, $\chi^2/df = 16.74$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.66; TLI = 0.53; RMSEA = 0.27), whereas the two-factor model displayed good fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 44.93$, $df = 19$, $\chi^2/df = 2.36$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.97; TLI = 0.96; RMSEA = 0.08). Supporting the distinctiveness of the measures for socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours, a chi-square difference test showed that the model fit improved significantly from the one-factor to two-factor model: $\chi^2(1, N = 208) = 289.93$, $p < 0.001$.

3.3.6 Managers' emotions about the negotiation process

At Time 2, managers were asked to think back to their most recent successful i-deal negotiation with the focal employee (*"Please think back to the most recent successful i-deal negotiation this employee had with you"*). They were then asked to state the frequency of emotions they had felt during this process (*"How frequently did you feel the [emotions] below during this process?"*). Ten items from Van Katwyk et al.'s Emotions at Work Index (2000) were used to capture managers' emotions. These items were selected to represent high, medium and low levels of arousal on the pleasure dimension of the index. The managers rated how frequently they had experienced five positive emotions (happy, satisfied, optimistic, relieved, joyful; $\alpha = 0.92$), and five negative emotions (angry, betrayed, disappointed, guilty, unhappy; $\alpha = 0.95$), on a scale ranging from (1) "never" to (5) "always". Managers' positive and negative emotions were treated as separate dimensions, and responses were aggregated into positive and negative emotions scores (e.g. Barsade & Gibson, 2007).

To ensure that managers' positive and negative emotions about the process of employee's most recent i-deal negotiations were distinct, CFA was carried out using AMOS 19.0 with maximum likelihood estimation (Byrne, 2001). A one-factor model showed poor fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 535.81$, $df = 35$, $\chi^2/df = 15.30$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.58; TLI = 0.47; RMSEA = 0.26), whereas a two-factor model

displayed good fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 80.28$, $df = 34$, $\chi^2/df = 2.36$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.96; TLI = 0.95; RMSEA = 0.08). A chi-square difference test showed that the model fit improved significantly from the one-factor model to the two-factor model, supporting the distinctiveness of managers' positive and negative emotions: $\chi^2(1, N = 130) = 455.53$, $p < 0.001$.

3.3.7 Control variables

The analysis initially controlled for age, gender, educational background, tenure in the organization and in the position for both subordinates and their managers that were measured in Time 1. However, the direction and strength of the results did not change when these control variables were included in the analyses, and were thus excluded.

Leader–member exchange relationship quality which was measured in Time 1 (i.e. LMX) was controlled for because previous research on i-deals has revealed that LMX is a predictor of successful i-deal negotiations (Anand et al., 2010) and of positive emotional reactions toward employees (Martin et al., 2015). To rule out potential confounding effects, LMX measured at Time 1 was controlled for using seven items from Liden and Maslyn's (1998) scale. An example item was “*My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend*” ($\alpha = 0.91$).

Employees' socially connecting and socially disconnecting behaviours were controlled for when testing for the moderating effect of managers' emotions on the association between the extent of negotiation and attainment of i-deals (H1).² Tests for associations between employees' socially connecting behaviours and managers' positive emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (H2) controlled for employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions.³ Similarly, employees' socially connecting behaviours and managers' positive emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations were controlled for when testing associations between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions (H3).⁴ Correlations between employees' socially connecting behaviours and managers'

² H1(a) with controls: $\gamma = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$. H1(a) without controls: $\gamma = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$. H1(b) with controls: $\gamma = -0.13$, $p < 0.05$. H1(b) without controls: $\gamma = -0.14$, $p < 0.05$.

³ H2 with controls: $\gamma = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$. H2 without controls: $\gamma = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$.

⁴ H3 with controls: $\gamma = 0.17$, $p < 0.05$. H3 without controls: $\gamma = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$.

negative emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations ($r = -0.26, p < 0.01$) and between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' positive emotions about that process ($r = -0.17, p < 0.05$) suggest that, in addition to employees' socially connecting behaviours, employees' socially disconnecting behaviours may influence managers' positive emotions (and vice versa for managers' negative emotions). To provide a more accurate estimation for these hypotheses, this control strategy was therefore adopted (Becker et al., 2016). The strength and direction of the results of the hypotheses did not change when not controlling for these variables.

3.3.8 Analytical strategy

The managers rated their emotions regarding their most recent successful i-deal negotiations with subordinates. Due to the nested structure of the data (Hox, 2002), multi-level analyses were carried out using MlwiN 2.20 (Rasbash et al., 2000). Two separate models were built for the dependent variables, using random intercept modelling. First, an intercept-only model was created, after which control and independent variables were entered. To control for within-group and between-group variances, grand-mean centred estimates were used for independent and control variables, while person-mean centred estimates were used for the moderator variables (Hox, 2002; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002).

To evaluate whether multi-level modelling was an appropriate approach, two strategies were followed. First, the intercept-only model was compared with a model with a fixed random element at Level 2 for managers' positive and negative emotions to employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (Klein et al., 2001). The deviance statistics for managers' positive emotions ($\Delta-2*\log = 4.85, p < 0.05$) and for managers' negative emotions ($\Delta-2*\log = 31.43, p < 0.001$) indicated that a model at Level 2 fitted the data significantly better than a model at Level 1.

Second, to estimate the percentage of variance attributable to managers' emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations, intraclass correlation (ICC) 1 values were calculated using MlwiN 2.20 (Rasbash et al., 2000). For managers' positive emotions, the ICC (1) was $= 0.23/1.11 = 21$ per cent. For managers' negative emotions, the ICC (1) was $= 0.70/1.01 = 69$ per cent. For the

attainment of i-deals, the ICC (1) was $= 0.04/0.38 = 11$ per cent. These results for the dependent variables suggest that the use of multi-level analysis was appropriate.

3.4 Results

Table 2 displays means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations from the analysis.

Table 2: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations

	Variables	Means	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	LMX (T1)	3.64	0.59	(0.91)						
2	Employees' socially connecting behaviours following most recent i-deal negotiations (T1)	3.48	0.76	0.02	(0.88)					
3	Employees' socially disconnecting behaviours following most recent i-deal negotiations (T1)	2.01	0.92	-0.07	-0.53**	(0.88)				
4	Extent of successful negotiation of i-deals (T1)	3.75	0.92	0.28**	0.38**	-0.19*	(0.88)			
5	Extent of attainment of i-deals (T2)	4.08	0.61	0.02	0.21*	-0.14	0.21*	(0.87)		
6	Managers' positive emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)	3.88	0.88	0.19*	0.28**	-0.17*	0.44**	0.24**	(0.92)	
7	Managers' negative emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)	2.30	0.84	-0.21*	-0.26**	0.35**	-0.28**	-0.23**	0.49**	(0.93)

Notes: n= 130 subordinates, 46 supervisors; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$. Reliabilities are shown along the diagonal in parentheses.

Prior to testing the hypotheses, a series of CFAs was conducted using AMOS 19.0 with maximum likelihood estimation (Byrne, 2001) to examine the factorial structures of the study's constructs. Hu and Bentler's (1999) recommendations are used to report the findings. The measurement model distinguishing between four factors – task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations, LMX, socially connecting, and socially disconnecting behaviours – all measured at Time 1 showed a satisfactory fit ($\chi^2 = 433.031$, $df = 183$, $\chi^2/df = 2.36$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.88; TLI = 0.88; RMSEA = 0.08). This model fitted the data significantly better than a model in which socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours were combined into a single factor ($\chi^2 = 724.695$, $df = 186$, $\chi^2/df = 3.89$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.74; TLI = 0.68; RMSEA = 0.12). The measurement model distinguishing between the three variables measured at Time 2 (obtained task and work responsibility i-deals, and managers' positive and negative emotions) also showed satisfactory fit ($\chi^2 = 175.090$, $df = 101$, $\chi^2/df = 1.73$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.94; TLI = 0.92; RMSEA = 0.07). This model fitted the data significantly better than a competing model in which positive and negative emotions were loaded onto a single factor ($\chi^2 = 363.449$, $df = 103$, $\chi^2/df = 3.52$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.79; TLI = 0.73; RMSEA = 0.14).

Hypothesis 1(a) is that managers' positive emotions about the process of focal employees' most recent i-deal negotiations will moderate the association between the extent of successful i-deal negotiation and subsequent attainment. After all control variables were entered, the interaction term between managers' positive emotions and successful task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations was significant ($\gamma = 0.12$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 3: Multilevel estimates for the interaction between managers' emotions about the process and the extent of successful negotiation predicting the extent of attainment of i-deals

Variable	Extent of Attainment of I-Deals (T2)								
	Est.	SE	t	Est.	SE	T	Est.	SE	T
Intercept	1.92	0.06	32.01	4.08	0.05	83.45	4.04	0.05	77.76
LMX (T1)	0.14	0.11	1.27	0.04	0.08	0.47	0.021	0.08	0.24
Employees' socially connecting behaviours following most recent i-deal negotiations (T1)	0.01	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.07	1.14	0.09	0.07	0.19
Employees' socially disconnecting behaviours following most recent i-deal negotiations (T1)	-0.25	0.08	-3.12**	-0.06	0.07	-0.93	-0.06	0.07	-0.93
Extent of successful negotiation of i-deals (T1)				0.06	0.07	0.93	0.11	0.08	1.41
Managers' positive emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)				0.07	0.07	1.01	0.02	0.07	0.3
Managers' negative emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)				-0.1	0.07	-1.42	-0.1	0.07	-1.46
Extent of successful negotiation of i-deals (T1) * managers' positive emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)							0.12	0.05	2.26*
Extent of successful negotiation of i-deals (T1) * managers' negative emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)							-0.13	0.06	-2.16*
-2LL	234.78			242.61			218.43		
Δ in -2LL	8.23* <i>a</i>			7.83*			24.18***		
df	3			3			2		
Between-level variance and standard error	0.03	(0.03)	0.02	(0.02)			0.02	(0.02)	
Within-level variance and standard error	0.33	(0.05)	0.32	(0.04)			0.29	(0.04)	

Notes: *a*, statistical comparison with an intercept-only model at Level 1 (not shown in the table). Est. = estimate. For all values, gamma coefficients, their corresponding standard error and t values are reported; n = 130 subordinates, 46 supervisors; * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

Following Dawson's unstandardized (2016) simple-slope analysis procedures, simple slopes were calculated for one standard deviation above and below the mean of the moderator, which was managers' positive emotions about the process of focal employees' most recent i-deal negotiations. The slope for high positive emotions of managers was positive and significant (gradient of simple slope = 0.71, t = 2.53,

$p < 0.05$), and the slope for low positive emotions was significant (gradient of simple slope = 0.54, $t = 2.42$, $p < 0.05$). Higher positive emotions about the process of focal employees' most recent i-deal negotiations thus strengthened the association between the extent of successful i-deal negotiations and the extent to which i-deals were obtained. Accordingly, Hypothesis 1(a) is supported.

Hypothesis 1(b) is that the association between the extent of successful i-deal negotiation and the extent of i-deal attainment will be moderated by managers' negative emotions about the process of focal employees' most recent i-deal negotiations. After entering the control variables, the interaction term between managers' negative emotions about the process of focal employees' most recent i-deal negotiations and successful task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations was significant and negative ($\gamma = -0.13$, $p < 0.05$). As for H1(a), simple slopes were calculated for one standard deviation above and below the mean of the moderator, which was manager's negative emotions about focal employees' most recent i-deal negotiations. The slope for high negative emotions of managers was negative and significant (gradient of simple slope = -0.46, $t = 2.22$, $p < 0.05$), and the slope for low negative emotions was not significant (gradient of simple slope = 0.06, $t = 0.51$, $p = 0.61$). Thus, higher levels of i-deal negotiation were associated with lower levels of i-deal attainment when managers felt more negatively about the process of focal employees' most recent i-deal negotiations. Hypothesis 1(b) is therefore partially supported (see Table 3).

Hypothesis 2 is that employees' socially connecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations will be positively associated with managers' positive emotions about the negotiation process. After controlling for LMX, managers' negative emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations and employees' socially disconnecting behaviours, this association was positive and significant ($\gamma = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$), supporting Hypothesis 2 (see Table 4).

Hypothesis 3 posits a positive association between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions about the process of the employees' most recent i-deal negotiations. After controlling for LMX, managers' positive emotions about the process of the focal employees' most recent

i-deal negotiations and employees' socially connecting behaviours, this association was significant ($\gamma = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$). This finding supports Hypothesis 2 (see Table 4).

Table 4: Multilevel regression analyses for employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours and managers' emotions about recent i-deal negotiations

Variables	Managers' Positive Emotions about the Process of Employees' Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)						Managers' Negative Emotions about the Process of Employees' Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)					
	Est.	SE	t	Est.	SE	t	Est.	SE	t	Est.	SE	t
Intercept	3.88	0.06	64.66	3.88	0.06	64.66	1.92	0.07	26.62	1.92	0.06	31.39
LMX (T1)	0.14	0.11	1.27	0.17	0.11	1.54	-0.18	0.11	-1.63	-0.15	0.11	-1.50
Managers' negative emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)	-0.51	0.08	-6.25***	-0.47	0.08	-5.87***						
Managers' positive emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations (T2)							-0.41	0.08	-5.12***	-0.41	0.07	-5.85***
Employees' socially connecting behaviours following most recent i-deal negotiations (T1)				0.30	0.09	2.52**	-0.15	0.08	-1.87	-0.01	0.09	-0.11
Employees' socially disconnecting behaviours following most recent i-deal negotiations (T1)	-0.18	0.09	2.00*	-0.12	0.08	-1.50				0.33	0.12	2.75**
-2LL	297.06			290.22			255.26			248.15		
Δ in -2LL	35.75*** ^a			6.84**			36.81*** ^b			7.11**		
df	3			1			3			1		
Between-level variance and standard error	0.12	(0.07)		0.11	(0.06)		0.48	(0.13)		0.44	(0.13)	
Within-level variance and standard error	0.49	(0.07)		0.47	(0.07)		0.24	(0.03)		0.23	(0.03)	

Notes: *a*, *b* statistical comparison with an intercept-only model at Level 1 (not shown in the table). Est. = estimate. For all values, gamma coefficients, their corresponding standard error and t values are reported; $n = 130$ subordinates, 46 supervisors; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

3.5 Discussion

3.5.1 Theoretical contributions

Organizations have begun to use individualized HR practices such as i-deals to meet the unique work-related needs of their employees and maintain their commitment

to the organization (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015). Indeed, research has shown that organizations tend to benefit from i-deals, for instance in the form of greater affective commitment and higher levels of work performance (Anand et al., 2010). However, less is known about the aftermath of i-deal negotiations. This is surprising given that, in theory, the benefits of i-deals are supposed to arise from their attainment rather than from the negotiation process (Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006). This study focuses on the role of managers, who are crucial to the attainment of negotiated i-deals. It contributes to the i-deals literature in several ways.

The first contribution relates to its focus on the aftermath of i-deal negotiations. A core characteristic of i-deals is that they are negotiated between an employee and a manager, resulting in an actual “deal” (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016). In essence, i-deals are the outcomes of negotiation (Rousseau, 2005). Despite acknowledgment that there are important aspects beyond the negotiation of i-deals (Bal & Rousseau, 2015), previous research has focused on i-deal negotiations (Ng & Feldman, 2012), overlooking whether or not negotiated i-deals are actually obtained (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015). This study conceptualizes the attainment of i-deals as a second step following i-deal negotiations. Importantly, it focuses on the extent to which i-deals are obtained, given that the benefits of i-deals are likely to be realized only on their attainment (Bal et al., 2012). This is one of the first studies to conceptualize i-deals in different phases.

The second contribution relates to the role of managers in implementing successfully negotiated deals, and specifically their emotions with respect to the process of negotiated i-deals. I-deals are examples of individualized HR practices, and managers may influence their implementation (Bos-Nehles, 2010; Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2009). Indeed, a growing body of research (e.g. McDermott et al., 2013; Stanton et al., 2010) has shown that managers have the power to modify existing HR practices. While the range of formal policies defining HR practices may vary across organizations (Guest, 2011; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007), it has frequently been observed that managers shape existing HR practices by introducing flexibilities or re-defining HR practices, giving rise to i-deals (Alfes et al., 2013; Khilji & Wang, 2006; Nishii & Wright, 2008). For example, managers may provide educational leave to certain employees, allowing them to take time off for personal

interests (Hochschild, 1997). While the implementation of i-deals is likely to be influenced by many factors (Dany, Guedri & Hatt, 2008), the current research results suggest that successful implementation is also heavily influenced by whether managers evaluate focal employees' behaviour following initial negotiations of i-deals as being in line with managerial goals in honouring the deals.

The study's focus on managers' emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations contributes to research on differentiated HR practices. Previous research has emphasized the "sense-giving" role of managers in implementing differentiated HR practices (McDermott et al., 2013; Maitlis, 2005). Managers provide clues to employees about the content of HR practices and policies, including when, to whom and why these practices may be applied (Maitlis, 2005). To employees, managers' emotions may thus serve as powerful sources of sense-giving, reflecting managers' future intentions and decisions concerning employees' differentiated HR arrangements (MacDermott et al., 2013). The study's focus on managers' emotions also complements previous research on the role of emotions in individual decision-making processes (e.g. Little, Gooty & Williams, 2016). For example, Maitlis and Ozcelik (2004) underline this role and reveal that employees' positive and negative emotions lead to different decisions in organizational settings.

This study proposes that managers' emotions influence the extent to which negotiated deals are obtained; thus, factors that may influence managers' emotions have been explored. The goal of managers in providing i-deals is to ensure that they will contribute to team cohesion and effectiveness; hence, they seek to make sense of how employees will use their i-deals on receipt of them (Kelley & Michela, 1980). In the context of i-deals, understanding how they will be used by employees on their attainment is especially important because such deals deviate from the conditions of other team members. While no research has been carried out on the specific behaviours of employees that facilitate the attainment of i-deals, a meta-analysis (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016) and a review study on the contextual nature of i-deals (Bal et al., 2012) have highlighted that employees may seek, and hence utilize, i-deals for different reasons. This study contributes to research on i-deals by exploring how employees' socially connecting and disconnecting

behaviours following i-deal negotiations influence their managers' emotions about the process of the negotiations. In observing employees' socially connecting behaviours following i-deal negotiations, managers may expect the recipients of i-deals to share their benefits with co-workers, providing consistency with the managers' goal of ensuring that i-deals contribute to effective team functioning.

In addition to employees' socially connecting behaviours, this study has also explored the association between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours in the aftermath of negotiated i-deals and managers' negative emotions about the negotiation process. The findings suggest that managers evaluate and react negatively to the socially disconnecting behaviours of employees in the aftermath of i-deal negotiations. Managers may expect that, on attainment of i-deals, i-dealers will use these deals only for their own benefit. Such behaviours are likely to lead to perceptions of favouritism among team members. In determining whether or not to support employees in obtaining i-deals, managers may thus also consider the perceptions of others in the organization. This highlights the importance of considering the wider social context when studying i-deals.

It is also noteworthy that zero-order correlations indicate a significant negative association between managers' negative emotions and employees' socially connecting behaviours, as well as between managers' positive emotions and employees' socially disconnecting behaviours. Managers' negative and positive emotions are also negatively related. However, these effects disappear when managers' positive and negative emotions are analyzed simultaneously. Our results therefore complement research which argues that positive and negative emotions are independent of each other, with different antecedents (e.g. Moors et al., 2013).

Furthermore, in line with the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations may facilitate their attainment of negotiated i-deals, mediating the association between the extent of successful i-deal negotiation and attainment. Two alternative models were tested, using the Monte Carlo Method for Assessing Mediation (MCMAM).⁵ An online tool developed by Selig and Preacher (2008)

⁵ This method used simulations with 20,000 iterations, relying on a product-of-coefficients (ab) approach, where ab was equal to the product of (a) the regression path between non-entitlement to

was used to calculate confidence intervals. Model 1 tested the mediation of employees' socially connecting behaviours between the extent of employees' successful i-deal negotiations and their attainment. The findings do not support this argument, as the confidence intervals included a value of zero ($\gamma = 0.09$ (0.50), $p = 0.18$; 95% CI = [-0.009/0.087]). Model 2 tested the mediation of employees' socially disconnecting behaviours between the extent of employees' successful i-deal negotiations and their attainment. This argument is also not supported, as the confidence intervals included a value of zero ($\gamma = 0.05$ (0.25), $p = 0.23$; 95% CI = [-0.046/0.013]). According to these findings, employees may reciprocate only for obtained, rather than negotiated, i-deals. Future research might explicitly integrate reciprocity into i-deals research (e.g. felt obligation) and explore the potential effects of obtained i-deals on focal employees' work behaviours.

3.5.2 Practical implications

I-deals are becoming strategic HRM tools to attract and retain talented employees (Bal et al., 2015; Ng & Feldman, 2012). The results of this study suggest that it is useful to distinguish between the extent to which i-deals are negotiated and actually obtained. Moreover, the results demonstrate that managers feel positive about the process of i-deal negotiations with employees who show socially connecting behaviours. In contrast, when employees fail to connect with their co-workers, their managers may not support them in obtaining negotiated i-deals. Organizations and managers seeking to use i-deals as a strategic tool to motivate and retain employees and improve their performance must therefore be transparent about how they expect these deals to be used. For employees negotiating i-deals, it must be clear that these deals are intended to benefit the entire team and that their benefits must be shared. Accordingly, HR departments and managers should encourage formal mechanisms such as mentoring (Nielsen, Carlson & Lankau, 2001), coaching and communication interventions (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001) to enhance connecting behaviours. Training and development to minimize socially disconnecting behaviours in teams would also be useful.

flexitime and fairness perceptions, and (b) the regression path between fairness perceptions and affective commitment (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009). The distribution of the product method (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009) was then used to calculate confidence intervals and validate the ab coefficients. When the confidence intervals do not contain zero, an indirect effect is established.

3.5.3 Limitations and future research directions

The strengths of this study include the use of a two-wave research design and data from multiple sources. However, it also has some limitations. Although data were collected at two measurement points and ratings obtained from supervisors, no causal relationships could be established between the study's variables. Longitudinal designs are needed to strengthen the causal claims of this research stream.

A second limitation relates to the assumption that managers evaluate employees' socially connecting (versus disconnecting) behaviours to establish whether these behaviours are congruent with the managers' goals in honouring i-deals and, as a result, feel positively (versus negatively) about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations. However, the study did not test explicitly whether the goals of employees in requesting i-deals were the same as those of managers. Future studies might investigate more directly the congruence between managers' and employees' goals in i-deals processes.

Measurement of managers' emotions captured their emotional reactions to the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations. However, the theorization was built on the assumption that managers react positively (versus negatively) to the socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours of employees following their most recent i-deal negotiations. Other factors beyond focal employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours, such as budget constraints in the work team, may influence managers' emotions in the negotiation process. Future research might remedy this limitation by explicitly measuring managers' emotional reactions to employee behaviours following i-deal negotiations.

While the focus of this study was on employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours directed at their co-workers, as discussed above, managers may prioritize their own interests in facilitating the attainment of i-deals. Research on flexible work arrangements has shown that managers tend to act in their own interests when agreeing on alternative work arrangements (Powell & Mainiero, 1999) and attribute employees' use of FWPs to their own self-interests (e.g. Leslie et al., 2012). Since i-deals are individually negotiated with managers, future research might explore whether managers prioritize the interests of the team

or their own interests, and the conditions under which managers are likely to make unfavourable attributions of employees' use of i-deals.

The idea that managers observe employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours suggests that some employees may engage in impression management behaviours to influence their managers. To rule out this possibility, *post hoc* analysis controlled for employees' impression management motives in testing the association between employees' behaviours and managers' emotions (H2 and H3). The results reveal that managers' emotions about the process of employees' most recent i-deal negotiations were not significantly influenced by employees' impression management motives.⁶ Future research might evaluate whether co-workers' reactions to focal employees' obtained i-deals may be influenced by the latter's impression management motives.

In this study, participants may have worked in different work teams but reported to the same manager, as in a matrix organizational structure. Whether or not they work in the same work team but report to the same manager is important because this structural work condition influences their task interdependence with other co-workers, and hence imposes limitations on the manager regarding the provision of i-deals to focal employees (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2009). Future research should take into account the impact of such structural work conditions (e.g. task interdependence, working in the same work team or not) on the association between the negotiation and attainment of i-deals.

The focus of this study is on the association between the extent of successful negotiation and attainment of i-deals. However, what is successfully negotiated may not actually be obtained, leading to perceptions of breaches of i-deals. Future research might integrate a psychological contract perspective and explore what factors hamper the attainment of successfully negotiated i-deals, as well as the effects of breaches of i-deals on employees' work behaviours and attitudes.

The research participants in this study were managers. Due to their knowledge, experience and expertise, they were likely to be better equipped than their non-managerial counterparts to negotiate for and obtain i-deals. Previous research has

⁶ The impression management motives of employees were measured at Time 1, using Rioux and Penner's (2001) 11-item scale. Detailed results are available from the first author on request.

suggested that i-deals are only negotiated by star performers (Rousseau & Kim, 2006). Given the general decrease in collective agreements (Glassner & Keune, 2012), and to enhance the generalizability of the findings, future studies should explore i-deals with non-managerial employees.

This research has focused on the aftermath of i-deal negotiations. Future research might explore the behaviours of employees following the attainment of i-deals, in terms of whether employees share the benefits with team members or keep the benefits to themselves. In this respect, future research might integrate the role of co-workers and explore whether and how a focal employee's obtained i-deals benefit or harm co-workers in a work team. This would add clarity to the conceptualization of i-deals as intended to be beneficial to teams (Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006).

This study has focused specifically on task and work responsibility i-deals. Because the nature of flexibility i-deals is different from that of task and work responsibility i-deals (Rosen et al., 2013), these findings cannot be generalized to all types of i-deal. Future studies should explore different theoretical mechanisms to test and explain the unique effects of flexibility i-deals and differentiate them from task and work responsibility i-deals.

Finally, this study was conducted in a Turkish business context where paternalism is a dominant cultural value (Aycan et al., 2013). Paternalism refers to hierarchical relationships in which managers are expected to care for, protect and guide their subordinates in their work and non-work lives (Aycan et al., 2013). In such work contexts, employees are likely to feel comfortable in approaching their managers and negotiating for specific work arrangements such as i-deals. Future research might explore the effects of different cultural values on the negotiation and attainment of i-deals.

3.6 Conclusion

This study contributes to an understanding of the extent to which successfully negotiated i-deals are actually obtained. In highlighting the relationship between employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following their most recent i-deal negotiations and managers' emotions about the negotiation process, it

underscores the importance of how employees are likely to use their negotiated i-deals, and the key role of managers in the implementation of i-deals.

Chapter 4: A Done Deal? Differentiating between Negotiated and Obtained I-Deals⁷

In light of the changing nature of careers in decentralized work settings (Hall, 1976, 2002) individuals are increasingly assuming greater responsibility for their own careers (Brisco & Hall, 2006). Employers thus face the challenge of maintaining the loyalty and commitment of their employees (Ng & Feldman, 2012). In this context, one potential strategy is to provide employees with individualized work arrangements to meet their development and growth needs at work. These are known as idiosyncratic deals, or i-deals (Rousseau, 2005). These personalized agreements, typically negotiated between employee and supervisor, are intended to provide direct benefits to their recipients (Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006; Rousseau, 2005) in the form of training and developmental opportunities, known as task and work responsibility i-deals, and flexibilities regarding where, when and how work is completed, known as flexibility i-deals (Rosen et al., 2013).


Researchers have begun to demonstrate that successful i-deal negotiations are positively associated with employee attitudes such as affective commitment (Ng & Feldman, 2010), and behaviours such as helping co-workers and the organization (Anand et al., 2010). These studies have assumed that successfully negotiated i-deals are actually obtained, leading to favourable attitudes and behaviours. However, this assumption is problematic, because not all i-deals that are successfully negotiated are actually obtained. Successfully negotiated i-deals may not be obtained immediately (Rousseau, Hornung & Kim, 2009), if at all (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015), which is likely to affect employee behaviour in the long term. Hence, it is currently unknown whether the effects on employees' behaviours are due to the negotiation of i-deals or, as the research to date has assumed, to their attainment. The latter has not yet been tested empirically.

In differentiating between negotiation and attainment of i-deals, the goal of this study is to explore the mechanisms through which successfully negotiated i-deals may influence employees' work performance in the long term. Building on

⁷ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 74th Academy of Management Conference. This paper was previously submitted to and rejected by the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. This version incorporates feedback from the reviewers; Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (to be submitted), target journal: *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

signalling theory as an overarching theoretical framework (Connelly et al., 2011), the study introduces 1) employees' positive emotions and 2) attainment of i-deals as two sequential mechanisms explaining why (or why not) successfully negotiated i-deals may lead to better work performance in the long term. It argues that successful negotiation of an i-deal acts as a signal of intent, conveying the organization's willingness to grant an i-deal to the focal employee. In response to successfully negotiated i-deals, it is proposed that employees feel positive, projecting not only their inner states, in that they have interpreted the message of i-deal negotiations accurately (Connelly et al., 2011), but also their actions, which they are likely to sustain until the negotiated deals are obtained (Keltner & Haidt, 2001). Attainment of i-deals, in turn, may relate positively to employees' work performance, above and beyond the effects of successfully negotiated i-deals.

This study contributes to i-deals research by introducing two mechanisms that shed light on how and why negotiated i-deals may be associated with long-term work performance. This is important because previous research has revealed weak, and at best inconsistent, findings regarding the effects of i-deal negotiations on employees' work performance (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016). As a first mechanism, the study's focus on employees' positive emotions goes beyond previous research, which has tended to focus on physical job characteristics such as autonomy or task significance (Hornung et al., 2009) and social exchange mechanisms (e.g. Liu et al., 2013) to explain how negotiated i-deals influence employees' behaviours. Thus, this is the first study to emphasize the importance of employees' positive emotions in relation to i-deals. In separating employees' i-deal negotiations from attainment, the study's focus on the attainment of i-deals as a second mechanism demonstrates that it is the content of i-deals and not the negotiation *per se* that explains why their recipients perform better. It therefore provides a nuanced perspective on the conceptualization of the i-deals process. A two-wave, multi-source study of employees and their managers was carried out to explore the conceptual model, as depicted in Figure 2.



Note. Dotted lines refer to the sequential mediation (H4)

Figure 2: Conceptual model

4.1 I-Deal Negotiations and Employees' Work Performance in the Long Term: Two Sequential Mechanisms

4.1.1 The role of positive emotions in linking i-deal negotiations and attainment

Negotiating for and obtaining i-deals are interdependent yet distinct steps. Negotiation is a step initiated by the employee asking for individualized work arrangements, while attainment is the provision of these work arrangements to the focal employee (Rousseau, 2005). It has been assumed that employees who successfully negotiate i-deals will automatically obtain them (Ng & Feldman, 2012), yet not all negotiated i-deals may actually be obtained (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015; Ho & Tekleab, 2016). To explore how negotiated i-deals influence employees' work performance in the long term, this study introduces two sequential mechanisms: employees' positive emotions and the attainment of i-deals. First, the role of employees' positive emotions is delineated, building on signalling theory to explore why the way employees feel about successful i-deal negotiations helps them obtain these deals.

According to signalling theory, the effectiveness of signalling depends on whether the message is interpreted in a manner consistent with the actual intention of the signaller (Connelly et al., 2011; Stiglitz, 2002). As noted by Connelly (2011, p.55), "receivers may apply weights to signals in accordance with the preconceived importance of the original intent of the signaller". Accurate interpretation of the signals evokes cognitive consistency, leading to positive reactions by signal recipients (Belogolovsky & Bamberger, 2014). From the perspective of an employee receiving an i-deal, successful negotiation of the i-deal acts as a signal of intent, conveying not only recognition of the employee's value by his or her

manager (Ho & Kong, 2015), but also the manager's intention to ensure that the focal employee obtains the negotiated i-deal. Thus, the first hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive association between successful i-deal negotiations and employees' positive emotions.

From the perspective of emotions as signals (Brown & Consedine, 2004), individuals' emotions serve two main functions: first, they reflect one's inner state (Hareli & Hess, 2012); and second, they provide information about the intentions of the individual experiencing these emotions (Hareli, Shomrat & Hess, 2009; Van Kleef, 2010). Accordingly, emotions may be considered as external indications of one's internal states and intentions, delivering information to others (e.g. Hess, Adams & Kleck, 2005). Research on the role of emotions as signals supports these arguments (Brown & Consedine, 2004; Fridlund, 1992; Hess, Adams & Kleck, 2005; Said, Sebe & Todorov, 2009). For example, Van Kleef, de Dreu and Manstead (2004b) find that positive emotions facilitate the realization of a negotiated deal. The authors argue that positive emotions, as containers of social information, signal to the other party that the situation is congruent with the motivational state of the individual, hence positively influencing the realization of a negotiated deal. From this perspective, in the context of i-deals, positive emotions may explain why employees who have successfully negotiated i-deals persist until these deals are obtained. The negotiation literature also supports this argument. For instance, Kopelman, Rosette and Thompson (2006) stress that positive emotions facilitate the possibility of realizing a negotiated deal in the future. In a recent review, Olekalns and Druckman (2014) place positive emotions among the most crucial mechanisms for turning a negotiation into a deal. Thus, the second hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive association between employees' positive emotions and attainment of successfully negotiated i-deals.

4.1.2 Attainment of i-deals and employees' work performance

According to signalling theory, the degree to which signals elicit positive behaviours from their recipients depends on the extent to which the signaller is honest with the receiver. This is referred to as signaller reliability (Connelly et al., 2011). It means that the ongoing actions and decisions of the signaller (e.g. the

manager, as agent of the organization) should not contradict the initial intention of the signal (Gao et al., 2008) so that the receiver is not confused and does not feel deceived (Chung & Kalnins, 2001). Research supports that consistency of signals from the same source over time results in positive responses by their recipients. For example, Fischer and Reuber (2007) show that there is a positive association between the consistency of signals used by firms to form impressions of attributes in stakeholders' minds and the extent of reputational consensus that stakeholders develop regarding firms' attributes over time. Similarly, Gao et al. (2008) demonstrate that the consistent communication of corporate strategy during an initial public offering (IPO) impacts positively on the initial returns of companies. In the context of i-deals, the provision of negotiated i-deals arguably reflects how consistent an employer is in providing the successfully negotiated i-deal to the focal employee. This consistency is likely to influence employee performance positively because, in line with signalling theory, the focal employee is less likely to feel deceived (Connelly et al., 2011).

However, beyond signal consistency, delivering successfully negotiated i-deals to focal employees may improve work performance because, through i-deals which are individualized to address employees' work needs and preferences, they are more likely to perform well in their tasks. The content of what is delivered in i-deals, such as personalized skills development opportunities and training aimed at career growth, is likely to provide developmental opportunities and enable their recipients to perform their jobs better (e.g. Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). HRM research supports this argument, showing that training and development opportunities contribute to human capital development (Youndt & Snell, 2004) and are positively associated with employees' work performance (Korff, Biemann & Voelpel, 2016; Kuvaas, 2008). Thus, the third hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive association between attainment of i-deals and employees' work performance.

The combination of Hypotheses 1 to 3 suggests a sequence of effects on employees' work performance initiated by successful negotiation of i-deals. In the few studies that have examined the direct effects of i-deal negotiations on employees' work performance, it has been argued that successful i-deal negotiations drive improved

work performance because i-deals entail special and valuable resources for which employees feel indebted to their managers (Ng & Feldman, 2015; Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2009). However, the positive effects of i-deal negotiations are likely to be observed only when they are obtained (Bal & Rousseau, 2015); therefore, successful i-deal negotiations are unlikely to have a direct positive effect on employees' work performance in the long term. This study argues that the effects of i-deal negotiations are transmitted to work performance through two mechanisms: (1) employees' positive emotions, which (2) facilitate the attainment of i-deals that provide the necessary resources for employees to perform better in their jobs. This argument is in line with a recent meta-analysis (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016) and a conceptual review study (Bal & Rousseau, 2015), which emphasize that the effects of i-deal negotiations may not be long-lasting, and that i-deal negotiations may only affect work behaviours indirectly. I-deal negotiations may function as initiators of a sequence of effects that leads to enhanced work performance in the long term. It is expected that employees' positive emotions and attainment of i-deals will act as mechanisms between successful i-deal negotiations and employees' work performance. Thus, the final hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 4: Successful i-deal negotiations are positively associated with employees' work performance in the long term only, first through employees' positive emotions (H4a) and then through attainment of i-deals (sequential mediation).

4.2 Method

4.2.1 Procedure and sample

The data collection for Study 1 took place between May 2013 and June 2014. Participants of Study 2 included executive MBA (EMBA) students and their managers at a leading Turkish university. The language of education was English, and admission to the programme required several years of professional experience and considerable previous academic success. It was thus expected that these executives would be likely to have taken proactive steps toward their self-development and career progress, and would have had experience of negotiating and obtaining i-deals. Following the approvals of the director at the university, the survey items were translated into Turkish using back-translation procedures

(Brislin, 1986). The wording of the items was first discussed with four professors from relevant fields. Then, the survey was pre-tested with twelve Turkish doctoral students. Following minor adjustments, the final survey was back-translated by a professional translator, as recommended to ensure face validity (Prieto, 1992).

Data were collected from respondents at two time points, separated by six months. This time interval was consistent with previous i-deals research (e.g. Ng & Feldman, 2012) and with studies that have examined intra-individual changes in employee behaviours (e.g. Jokisaari & Nurmi, 2009 used an eight-month interval to study work performance), and is the suggested interval for studies using student participants (Demerouti & Rispens, 2014).

At Time 1 which started in May 2013, personalized e-mails were sent with a link to a web-based survey to 821 EMBA students in full-time employment. A total of 225 responses were obtained, representing a response rate of 27 per cent. A total of 17 surveys were not used because of missing data and incomplete responses. In the end, 208 surveys were used at Time 1, reflecting a response rate of 25 per cent. At Time 2 (June, 2014), a total of 148 responses were obtained from employees who participated in Time 1, reflecting a response rate of 71 per cent. Due to missing and incomplete data, only 130 surveys were used in Time 2, reflecting a response rate of 63 per cent. None of the study variables or demographic variables differed between employees who only participated at Time 1 and those who participated at both times.

The employees provided the contact details of their supervisors, who were then contacted by one of the authors via e-mail or telephone. The supervisors assessed the behavioural outcomes of their subordinates in a paper-based questionnaire. At Time 1, 112 were approached and due to the missing data, only 103 surveys were used from managers, providing a response rate of 92 per cent. In Time 2, 55 managers participated and due to the missing data, 46 surveys were used from managers in Time 2 (84 per cent). In the end, the final sample of Study 1 consisted of matched data for 130 employees and 46 managers. On average, one manager supervised 2.82 employees ($SD = 1.35$). The number of employees supervised by a single manager ranged from one to eight.

The employee sample was 53 per cent male. Sixty-one per cent of respondents were middle-level managers, and 39 per cent front-line managers. The average age was 29.2 years (SD = 4.6). Average tenure in the organization was 3.8 years (SD = 3.3), and average tenure in the current role was 2.5 years (SD = 2.7). The supervisor sample was 67 per cent male, with an average age of 34.2 (SD = 5.65). On average, supervisors had worked in the organization for 5.2 years (SD = 2.3), and in their current role for 4.3 years (SD = 2.2).

4.2.2 Measures

Negotiation of I-Deals. At Time 1, Rosen et al.'s (2013) scale was used to assess the degree to which employees had successfully negotiated task and work responsibility i-deals (six items) and flexibility i-deals (three items). The items were rated on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree". First the employees were provided with a definition of i-deals (Rousseau, 2005, p. 93): "I-deals are voluntary, personalized agreements of a nonstandard nature negotiated between individual employees and their employers regarding terms that benefit each party". The participants were then asked to indicate to what extent they had successfully negotiated i-deals with their supervisors within the past six months. An example for task and work responsibility i-deals was "*I have negotiated with my supervisor for tasks that better develop my skills*" ($\alpha = 0.88$), and an example for flexibility i-deals was "*I have negotiated a unique arrangement with my supervisor that allows me to complete a portion of my work outside the office*" ($\alpha = 0.76$).

Attainment of I-Deals. At Time 2, employees were asked to consider the time period since the last survey, which was six months. The degree to which employees had obtained the i-deals they had successfully negotiated at Time 1 was measured by adapting Rosen et al.'s (2013) scale. Participants who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" for any of the i-deal negotiation items at Time 1 were asked to indicate the extent to which they had obtained those i-deals. An example item for task and work responsibility i-deals was "*I obtained tasks that better develop my skills*" ($\alpha = 0.88$, from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree"). An example item for flexibility i-deals was "*I obtained a unique arrangement that allows me to*

complete a portion of my work outside the office” ($\alpha = 0.74$, from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”).

Positive Emotions. Seven items from Van Katwyk et al.’s (2000) Emotions at Work Index were selected to represent high (enthusiastic, compassionate), medium (happy, proud and optimistic), and low (grateful and pleased) arousal levels for the pleasure dimension of the index ($\alpha = 0.92$). At Time 1, respondents rated how frequently they had experienced these emotions following their most recent i-deal negotiations, using a five-point scale ranging from (1) “never” to (5) “all of the time”. Responses were aggregated to a positive emotions score (e.g. Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Briner & Kiefer, 2005).

Work Performance. Supervisors rated employees’ work performance at Times 1 and 2 using a six-item scale drawn from Laurence’s (2010) study. The items assessed performance in relation to pre-set standards for the job, for managers’ expectations, and in comparison with the performance of colleagues. An example item was *“In general this employee’s performance is better than the work performance of most of his/her co-workers, compared to others in similar positions”* ($\alpha = 0.90$ at Time 1; $\alpha = 0.96$ at Time 2; from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”).

Control Variables. The analysis initially controlled for age, gender, educational background, tenure in the organization and in the position for both subordinates and their managers that were measured in Time 1. The strengths and directions of the results of the analyses did not change hence they were excluded from the analyses.

Employees’ negative emotions, which was measured in Time 1, were controlled for in testing Hypotheses 1 and 2 and in calculating the second indirect effect for Hypothesis 4. Research on emotions shows that negative emotions reflect that a situation is incongruent with the motivation of the individual experiencing those emotions and obscures the individual’s goal achievement (Hareli & Hess, 2009; Van Kleef, 2010). To control for this confounding effect and to provide a more robust test for the results, the analysis controlled for employees’ negative emotions. Nine items from Van Katwyket al.’s (2000) Emotions at Work Index ($\alpha = 0.70$) were used. At Time 1, respondents rated how frequently they had experienced these emotions following their most recent i-deal negotiations, using a five-point scale

ranging from (1) “never” to (5) “all of the time”. In line with related research (e.g. Barsade & Gibson, 2007), the responses were aggregated to a negative emotions scale.

Testing of Hypothesis 3 controlled for Time 1 work performance and both types of i-deal negotiations, as well as employees’ positive and negative emotions, all measured at Time 1. This control strategy for work performance at Time 1 was intended to capture changes in employees’ work performance above and beyond their work performance measured at Time 1. The control strategy for emotions and i-deal negotiations aimed to provide a more conservative test of the effects of attainment of i-deals above and beyond the effects of i-deal negotiations and employees’ emotions (e.g. Becker et al., 2016).

4.2.3 Analytical strategy

Work performance was rated by supervisors, who evaluated, on average, 2.01 employees at Time 1 and 2.62 employees at Time 2. These observations were interdependent, and their nested structure needed to be taken into account (Hox, 2002). Thus, multi-level analyses were conducted using MlwiN 2.20 (Rasbash et al., 2000). Two separate models were built for the two dependent variables, using random intercept modelling. First, an intercept-only model was created, after which control variables and independent variables were entered. To control for within-group and between-group variances, grand mean-centred estimates were used for independent and control variables (Hox, 2002).

To evaluate whether multi-level modelling was an appropriate approach, the intercept-only model at level 1 was compared with a model with a fixed random part at level 2 for work performance measured at Time 2, the outcome variable (Klein et al., 2000). The deviance statistics for work performance showed that a model with level-2 predictors fitted the data better ($\Delta-2*\log = 7.42$, $p < 0.001$ for work performance). Moreover, the ICC (1) was calculated to establish the extent to which variance in performance could be attributed to manager evaluations. For Time 2 work performance, the ICC (1) was 17 per cent, suggesting that the use of multi-level analysis was appropriate.

To test the hypotheses on direct effects, multi-level regression analyses were conducted. To test the sequential mediation hypothesis (H4), two indirect effects

were tested: the indirect effects of employees' positive emotions between i-deal negotiations and attainment of i-deals; and the indirect effects of attainment of i-deals between employees' positive emotions and their work performance. These two indirect effects were statistically significant, so sequential mediation was established (MacKinnon, 2008). This strategy of analysis has been adopted in recent research (e.g. Bakker, Tims & Derks, 2012). To test each of the indirect effects, consistent with recent research on multi-level mediation analysis (e.g. Preacher, 2015), Monte Carlo (MC) simulations were run with 20,000 iterations to obtain confidence intervals for the proposed indirect effects.⁸

4.3 Results

Table 5 displays the means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations of the data.

Table 5: Means, standard deviations and correlations

	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations (Time 1)	3.75	0.92	0.91							
2	Flexibility i-deal negotiations (Time 1)	3.33	0.52	0.15	0.76						
3	Positive emotions (Time 1)	3.75	0.71	0.23**	0.14	0.92					
4	Negative emotions (Time 1)	2.71	0.62	0.02	0.31**	0.42**	0.7				
5	Attainment of task and work responsibility i-deals (Time2)	4.08	0.61	0.21*	0.11	0.25**	0.03	0.83			
6	Attainment of flexibility i-deals (Time 2)	3.84	0.71	0.18*	0.26**	0.29**	0.04	0.31**	0.74		
7	Work performance (Time 1)	3.72	0.69	0.01	0.04	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.14	0.90	
8	Work performance (Time 2)	3.84	1.01	0.14	0.08	0.17*	0.01	0.41**	0.26**	0.22*	0.96

Notes. n = 130 employees, 46 managers; * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001; reliabilities, where applicable, are shown along the diagonal in parentheses.

More than half of employees who had successfully negotiated i-deals at Time 1 had obtained the corresponding negotiated i-deal at Time 2. Specifically, among employees who had successfully negotiated task and work responsibility i-deals, 65

⁸ This is a product of a coefficients test using the bootstrap sampling method. This approach relies on parameter estimates and their associated asymptotic variances and co-variances. In particular, this method randomly draws from the joint distributions of the parameter estimates, calculates the product value of the two parameter estimates and repeats this many times. This method generates a more accurate estimation of the indirect effect than traditional methods (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009). The online interactive tool developed by Selig and Preacher (2008) was used. This generates an R code to obtain confidence intervals for the indirect effects. When confidence intervals do not contain zero, an indirect effect is established.

per cent strongly agreed or agreed that they had obtained these types of i-deal, while 11 per cent disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among employees who had successfully negotiated flexibility i-deals, 62 per cent strongly agreed or agreed that they had obtained these types of i-deal, while 12 per cent disagreed or strongly disagreed.

A series of confirmatory factor analyses was performed using AMOS 19.0 with maximum likelihood estimation (Byrne, 2001) to establish the discriminant validity of the variables. Hu and Bentler's (1999) recommendations are followed in reporting the findings. The measurement model, which distinguished between the five study variables (task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations, flexibility i-deal negotiations, positive emotions, negative emotions and work performance) assessed at Time 1, showed a satisfactory fit ($\chi^2 = 901.890$, $df = 367$, $\chi^2/df = 2.45$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.84; RMSEA = 0.07; SRMR = 0.07). The proposed model at Time 1 fitted the data significantly better than alternative models, including a model which combined both task and work responsibility and flexibility i-deal negotiations ($\chi^2 = 1219.494$, $df = 371$, $\chi^2/df = 3.28$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.74; RMSEA = 0.11; SRMR = 0.12). The measurement model distinguishing between the three study variables (obtained task and work responsibility i-deals, obtained flexibility i-deals, work performance) assessed at Time 2 also showed a satisfactory fit ($\chi^2 = 94.799$, $df = 62$, $\chi^2/df = 1.52$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.97; RMSEA = 0.06; SRMR = 0.06). This model demonstrated a significantly better fit than alternative models, including a model combining the two types of obtained i-deals ($\chi^2 = 197.260$, $df = 64$, $\chi^2/df = 3.08$, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.89; RMSEA = 0.13; SRMR = 0.13).

Hypothesis 1 proposes a positive association between successful i-deal negotiations and employees' positive emotions. After controlling for employees' negative emotions, the findings reveal that task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations were positively associated with employees' positive emotions ($\gamma = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$), while flexibility i-deal negotiations were not associated with employees' positive emotions ($\gamma = 0.11$, $p = 0.27$). Hypothesis 1 is thus partially supported (See Table 6 Model 1).

Hypothesis 2 proposes a positive association between employees' positive emotions and attainment of i-deals. After controlling for employees' negative

emotions and opposite types of i-deal negotiations, the results support this hypothesis (for task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations, $\gamma = 0.18$ $p < 0.01$, see Table 6 Model 2; for flexibility i-deal negotiations, $\gamma = 0.27$ $p < 0.01$, see Table 6 Model 3). Hypothesis 2 is therefore supported.

Hypothesis 3 proposes a positive association between attainment of i-deals and employees' work performance in Time 2. The analysis controlled for successful i-deal negotiations (both task and work responsibility and flexibility), work performance and employees' positive and negative emotions, all measured at Time 1. The results demonstrate that obtained task and work responsibility i-deals were significantly associated with work performance ($\gamma = 0.55$ $p < 0.001$), whereas obtained flexibility i-deals were not ($\gamma = 0.11$ $p = 1.01$), partially supporting Hypothesis 3 (see Table 6 Model 3).

Hypothesis 4 proposes that successful i-deal negotiations will be positively associated with work performance through employees' positive emotions (H4a) and attainment of i-deals (H4b), suggesting sequential mediation. The first indirect effect – the indirect effect of positive emotions between negotiation and attainment of i-deals – was significant only for task and work responsibility i-deals, as it did not include the value of zero (95% CI = [0.001/0.069] for task and work responsibility i-deals; 95% CI = [-0.023/0.092] for flexibility i-deals). The second indirect effect – the indirect effect of attainment of i-deals between employees' positive emotions and their work performance at Time 2 – was also significant only for task and work responsibility i-deals, as it did not include the value of zero (95% CI = [0.035/0.237] for task and work responsibility i-deals; 95% CI = [-0.008/0.013] for flexibility i-deals). These results partially support Hypothesis 4, underlining that only task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations have indirect effects on employees' work performance through the two sequential mechanisms. Flexibility i-deal negotiations have neither direct nor indirect associations with work performance in the long term.

In addition to the results of these hypotheses, the findings show that neither task and work responsibility nor flexibility i-deal negotiations significantly predicted employees' work performance at Time 2 (after controlling for work performance at Time 1, for task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations predicting work

performance at Time 2, $\gamma = 0.05$, $p = 0.24$; for flexibility i-deal negotiations predicting work performance at Time 2, $\gamma = 0.03$, $p = 0.28$; see Table 6 Model 4).

Table 6: Multi-level regression results for the effects of i-deal negotiations on employees' emotions, attainment of i-deals and work performance

	Positive Emotions (Time 1)			Attainment of Task and Work Responsibility I-Deals (Time 2)			Attainment of Flexibility I-Deals (Time 2)			Work Performance (Time 2)		
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
Variables	Estimate	SE	t	Estimate	SE	t	Estimate	SE	t	Estimate	SE	t
Intercept	3.75	0.06	62.51	4.07	0.06	67.83				3.86	0.09	42.88
Task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations (Time 1)	0.16	0.07	2.28*	0.11	0.05	2.21*				0.05	0.08	0.62
Flexibility i-deal negotiations (Time 1)	0.11	0.12	0.91				0.32	0.11	2.91	0.03	0.16	0.19
Negative emotions (Time 1)	0.07	0.11	0.63	0.05	0.08	0.62	0.02	0.09	0.22	0.02	0.12	0.16
Positive emotions (Time 1)				0.18	0.07	2.57**	0.27	0.08	3.37**	0.07	0.12	0.58
Work performance (Time 1)										0.21	0.11	1.91
Attainment of task and work responsibility i-deals (Time 2)										0.55	0.13	4.23***
Attainment of flexibility i-deals (Time 2)										0.11	0.11	1.01
-2LL	267.61			228.6			261.02			332.81		
Δ in -2LL	7.694*a			5.71*b			10.208**c			18.62**d		
D.F.	2			1			1			2		
Between-level variance and standard error	0.00	(0.00)		0.03	(0.03)		0.01	(0.03)		0.11	0.07	
Within-level variance and standard error	0.46	0.06		0.32	0.05		0.42	0.06		0.68	0.09	

Notes: *a, b, c, d* statistical comparison with an intercept-only model at level 1 (not shown in the table); the indirect effect was calculated using an online interactive tool that generates an R score (<http://quantpsy.org/medmc/medmc.htm>); all values, gamma coefficients, their corresponding standard error and t values are reported; n = 130 employees, 46 managers; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

4.4 Discussion

Changes in business settings such as rising competition and individualized careers have made i-deals a more common practice (Call, Nyberg & Thatcher, 2015), as evidenced in the decrease in collective bargaining across the globe, such as in the US (US Bureau of Labor Statistics), in the UK (Hoque & Bacon, 2014) and in Turkey (Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security). These changes imply that i-deals, as individualized HRM practices (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015), may be on the rise as a global phenomenon. Informed by recent i-deals research and drawing on signalling theory, this study aimed to address gaps regarding the conceptualization of i-deals (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015). In the next sections, the main

theoretical contributions of the findings are discussed, and some practical implications, limitations and future research directions are outlined.

4.4.1 Theoretical contributions

Employees' Positive Emotions as Signals in I-Deals. In disentangling the concept of i-deals into negotiation and attainment, the findings demonstrate that employees felt positive following their successful i-deal negotiations (task and work responsibility i-deals, H1). Employees' positive emotions were also positively associated with attainment of the corresponding type of i-deal, namely task and work responsibility i-deals (H2). The indirect effect of positive emotions was significant, emphasizing its role as a lynchpin between negotiation and attainment. This indicates that employees' positive emotions project that they have accurately interpreted signals of intent for successful i-deal negotiations (e.g. that the content of what is negotiated is relevant and valued), and that they are likely to sustain their actions until these negotiated deals are obtained. The findings regarding the role of positive emotions complement research on individualized HRM, in which the signalling quality of emotions is shown to be important for employees' experience of HR practices (e.g. Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). A display of positive emotions indicates that messages have meaning and relevance for recipients, and communicate recipients' internal states; in other words, there is a match between what is intended by the sender and what is interpreted by the receiver (Brown & Consedine, 2004). The finding regarding the role of positive emotions also complements previous research on the reinforcing role of positive emotions in sustaining work-related actions under uncertain conditions, such as the attainment of i-deals (e.g. Ilies & Judge, 2005; Tiedens & Linton, 2001). Emotions serve an adaptive coordination role, enabling individuals to address and benefit from encountered opportunities and deal with uncertainty effectively (Keltner & Lerner, 2010). The negotiation literature also stresses the adaptive role of positive emotions in translating a negotiated deal into its attainment (Kopelman, Rosette & Thompson, 2006; Thompson, Wang & Gunia, 2010; De Melo et al., 2013).

However, positive emotions had indirect effects only between task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations and their attainment. This indirect effect was not

observed for flexibility i-deals which, as discussed in the last part of this section, emphasizes the need to differentiate between the two types of i-deal.

Differentiating between Negotiation and Attainment of I-Deals. Previous studies have assumed that negotiated i-deals are automatically obtained, and hence lead to benefits for the recipient (Anand et al., 2010). However, a recent meta-analysis on i-deals reveals that the effects of successful i-deal negotiations on employee behaviours are relatively small (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016). Moreover, a cross-lagged study by Hornung, Rousseau and Glaser (2009) demonstrates that successful i-deal negotiations do not lead to improvements in work performance. These recent findings highlight that the relationship between i-deal negotiations and work performance may be more complex than previously assumed. Here, it is argued that i-deals do not necessarily end with negotiation, and that the attainment (versus negotiation) of i-deals explains how and why negotiation of i-deals may be associated with employees' work performance in the long term.

The findings demonstrate that attainment of i-deals is positively associated with the work performance of employees (H3). The effects of successfully negotiated i-deals on employees' work performance are significant only through employees' positive emotions and attainment of i-deals (H4), while successfully negotiated i-deals are not associated with work performance in the long term. These results indicate that, unlike the assumption of previous research, the effects of successful negotiations may not endure over time. This finding adds clarity to the concept of i-deals by emphasizing the need to differentiate between negotiation and attainment of i-deals.

Beyond Signaller Reliability. For signals to elicit favourable behaviours from their recipients, it is argued in this study that the actions of employers (i.e. managers) must be consistent, demonstrating signaller reliability. Under this logic, negotiated i-deals must be actually granted in order to elicit enhanced work performance. The findings partially support the signaller reliability argument because, contrary to expectation, only obtained task and work responsibility i-deals, and not obtained flexibility i-deals, were positively associated with work performance.

Going beyond the signaller reliability concept, this differential effect may be explained by the content of obtained task and work responsibility i-deals. Their positive effects on work performance may be due to the benefits they provide to

focal employees. Obtaining these i-deals, such as being assigned to new projects, may facilitate better person–job fit and provide skills development opportunities (Bal, Van Kleef & Jansen, 2015). Experiencing the benefits of an obtained i-deal may improve work performance because of the opportunities to develop work-related skills and capabilities (Lavelle, Rupp & Brockner, 2007), which may lead the i-dealer to be more attuned to his or her work context and deal with task-related problems in more effective ways (e.g. Carmeli & Spreitzer, 2009). While these mechanisms have yet to be tested empirically, the effects of obtained task and work responsibility i-deals may thus go well beyond signaller reliability and other concepts. Changes in employees’ work performance might be understood in terms of obtained individualized work-related opportunities that provide benefits in their own right, such as better work adjustment (Allen et al., 2013), better person–job fit (Bal, Van Kleef & Jansen, 2015), self-enhancement (Liu et al., 2013) and human capital development (Korff, Biemann & Voelpel, 2016). Further research is needed to explore these propositions.

Differentiating Between the Two Types of I-Deal. Research on i-deals has stressed that different i-deal types send different messages to their recipients (Ho & Kong, 2015). Reflecting this argument, different patterns emerged with respect to different types of i-deal in this study. Contrary to the effects of task and work responsibility i-deals, obtained flexibility i-deals were not associated with employees’ work performance. Moreover, unlike for task and work responsibility i-deals, positive emotions did not mediate the relationship between negotiated and obtained flexibility i-deals. These differential findings are in line with a recent study by Ho and Kong (2015), which shows that task i-deals are positively related to organizational citizenship behaviour, whereas financial i-deals are not. Turning to the results of this study, one possible explanation for the differential results is that it may take longer for the effects of flexibility i-deals to manifest. In support of this idea, previous research has demonstrated that it takes a long time for the effects of flexibility-oriented HRM practices on performance to be observed (e.g. one year in Jiang, Takeuchi & Lepak’s 2013 study). This may explain why obtained flexibility i-deals were not associated with increases in employees’ performance assessed after six months.

Another potential explanation is that our participants were relatively young (the average age was 29.2 years), and that flexibility i-deals address older and younger employees' needs in different ways (De Lange et al., 2010). Research on aging shows that younger employees tend to value and obtain skills and career development opportunities more than flexibility-oriented work arrangements (Bal & Kooij, 2011; Ebner, Freund & Baltes, 2006; Kooij et al., 2008; Korff, Biemann & Voelpel, 2016). The findings of this study are in line with such research. Among participants who had successfully negotiated task and work responsibility i-deals, 65 per cent had actually obtained these types of i-deal. In comparison, among employees who had successfully negotiated flexibility i-deals, 30 per cent had obtained these types of i-deal. Recent studies also support these arguments, showing that individualized HRM practices in the form of flexibility i-deals are more strongly related to work performance in older employees than in their younger colleagues (Bal et al., 2012; Lepak et al., 2006).

A further possible explanation for the differential effects may arise from managers' attributions for employees using flexibility and task i-deals. Research has shown that managers may interpret employees' flexible work arrangements as a signal that these employees have personal life responsibilities and priorities that may diminish their performance at work (Leslie et al., 2013). The degree to which managers attribute the use of flexible work arrangements to productivity or personal life priorities may influence how they evaluate the performance of employees using flexible work arrangements (McGloskey & Igarria, 2003). In this study, managers may have attributed the use of flexibility i-deals to employees prioritizing their personal lives, and therefore may have evaluated their work performance less favourably. Indeed, Bal and Rousseau (2015) argue that flexibility i-deals may be more relevant to non-work domains (e.g. family responsibilities, taking care of elderly relatives, hobbies), and that these types of i-deal may drive better work performance through other mechanisms, including family enrichment, decreased work–family conflict or mastery of personal hobbies. Further research is needed to explore how and why flexibility versus task and work responsibility i-deals predict employee outcomes differentially.

4.4.2 Practical implications

The findings show that obtaining task and work responsibility i-deals is associated with work performance. These results are in line with recent research that highlights the importance of individualized skills- and opportunity-enhancing HR practices for employee work performance (Jiang et al., 2012). Thus, performance may improve when organizations offer their employees opportunities to negotiate and implement individualized developmental HRM practices. Accordingly, managers might be advised to take an individualized approach and determine specific types of i-deal that will work best for both employee and organization. For example, employees might be provided with customized developmental i-deals (e.g. fast-track competency development training) before being promoted to a new role.

However, the findings reveal that it is the attainment of i-deals rather than their negotiation that leads to enhanced work performance after six months. Accordingly, HR departments, in collaboration with managers who enable i-deals, might develop and monitor guidelines regarding the i-deals process (Greenberg et al., 2004). In particular, managers as well as HR departments need to monitor carefully whether negotiated i-deals are successfully implemented.

The findings show that positive emotions are important outcomes of successful task and work responsibility i-deal negotiations and are likely to help employees persist in their implementation. Thus, employees might benefit from training interventions and individualized coaching on how to manage and maintain their positive affective states effectively when negotiating i-deals (Hülshager et al., 2013).

4.5 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

In addition to the study's theoretical and practical contributions, it also makes important methodological contributions, including its longitudinal design, the use of supervisor ratings, and the differentiation of measurement between negotiated and obtained i-deals. While experimental research designs are needed to support definitive conclusions about the direction of causality, the findings add to the overall rigour of this research stream.

Despite these strengths, the study also has limitations. First, affect was investigated retrospectively, asking individuals to reflect on how they had felt following their recent i-deal negotiations. However, research on emotions emphasizes that affect is

dynamic. Within-person designs using diary studies or experience-sampling approaches might better capture fluctuations in affect in response to i-deals (Beal et al., 2005).

Second, the participants in this study were managers. It is conceivable that employees in high-level positions are not only more successful in obtaining i-deals than employees in non-managerial positions, but also better at meeting expectations arising from such individualized work arrangements (e.g. expectations regarding work performance, commitment and loyalty). This may be due to a broad range of reasons, including experience, job-related knowledge, self-confidence and position power (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2009). Future research might explore the outcomes of i-deal negotiations and obtained i-deals, drawing on a broader sample.

Third, the consequences of unsuccessful i-deal negotiations were not investigated. More research is needed to understand the consequences of not fulfilling the expectations of negotiated i-deals. In addition, future research might investigate how and why some i-deals (and different types of i-deal) are obtained, while others are not. In particular, researching their differential effects will be critical to establishing new theoretical frameworks for different types of i-deal.

Fourth, employees were asked to reflect on their i-deal negotiations over the last six months. Research has shown that employees can accurately recall and report on significant work events over a year (e.g. Janssen, Müller & Greifeneder, 2011). However, i-deals negotiated six months ago and those negotiated one day ago may have differential effects in terms of, for instance, how focal employees feel about the negotiations (e.g. intensity of emotions). Future research might explore how the timing of i-deal negotiations influences their consequences (e.g. work performance and attainment of i-deals).

Fifth, the results reveal that task and work responsibility i-deals are positively related to work performance, while flexibility i-deals are not. This indicates a differential effect of different types of i-deal; however, the effects of flexibility i-deals were not tested on a relevant outcome, such as family enrichment. Future research on the differential effects of different types of i-deal would help clarify the arguments of i-deals theory.

Furthermore, the data for this study were collected in a Turkish business setting, where paternalism prevails as a dominant cultural value (Aycaan et al., 2013). Paternalism underlies the “fatherly” or “motherly” behaviours of supervisors toward their subordinates. In such a context, employees are likely to feel comfortable in initiating negotiations. Further research might explore different types of leadership to understand how and why i-deals are negotiated. Similarly, more research is needed to explore the effects of culture on the negotiation and implementation of i-deals. Studies on i-deals have been conducted in the US (Rousseau, Hornung & Kim, 2009), Germany (Hornung et al., 2010), the Netherlands (Bal et al., 2012), India (Anand et al., 2010), China (Liu et al., 2013) and Italy (Ng & Lucianetti, 2015). These research contexts are likely to reflect different organizational and national cultural characteristics, yet little research to date has examined directly the effects of culture on i-deal-related outcomes (see Liu et al., 2013 for an exception). Moreover, given that i-deals are seen as strategies to attract and motivate talented employees, a better understanding of cross-cultural differences would enable employers to manage a global workforce more effectively (Kirkman, Lowe & Gibson, 2006).

In conclusion, this study reveals that successful negotiation of task and work responsibility i-deals is positively associated with the work performance of employees in the long term through two sequential mechanisms: employees’ positive emotions and attainment of task and work responsibility i-deals. Neither task and work responsibility nor flexibility i-deal negotiations relate directly to work performance.

Chapter 5: The Downside of HR Differentiation: Exploring the Effects of Employee Non-Entitlement to Flexitime⁹

There is significant evidence to suggest that organizations are increasingly incorporating flexible work practices (FWPs) into their human resource (HR) strategies (Kelly & Moen, 2007; Leslie et al., 2012; Shockley & Allen, 2007). The popularity of FWPs, which provide employees with flexibility regarding when (flexitime) and where (flexi-location) work is carried out, is unsurprising given their potential benefits (Kossek et al., 2014). From an employee perspective, FWPs have the potential to help balance work/life commitments, which may increase job satisfaction (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). From an organizational perspective, they may increase employee motivation and attract and retain high performers (Galinsky, Bond & Sakai, 2008; Hill et al., 2008). This research focuses on flexitime for two reasons. First, recent research has revealed that flexitime is the most pervasive type of FWP that organizations provide to their employees (Galinsky, Bond & Sakai, 2008). Second, meta-analyses (Allen et al., 2013) and recent research on FWPs (Thompson, Payne & Taylor, 2015) have shown that flexitime is more closely related to positive employee outcomes, such as work–life balance and perceived organizational support, than flexibility regarding location.

While there is growing awareness of the potential benefits of flexitime for both individuals and organizations, evidence also suggests that such practices are often applied differentially across the workforce. Organizations may differentiate the provision of flexitime as a tool to motivate and retain certain groups of core or select employees, such as high performers (Becker, Huselid & Beatty, 2009). For example, Hoque and Noon (2004) demonstrate that managerial employees are more likely than non-managerial employees to be entitled to FWPs. However, differentiating between employees who are or are not entitled to FWPs may raise concerns about the fairness of their implementation (Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013). Nevertheless, research to date has overlooked the potentially negative implications of non-entitlement to flexitime for individuals in workplaces where others are entitled to it, having frequently assumed that in workplaces where

⁹ This paper has been accepted for presentation at the 2nd Applied Psychology Conference, CIPD, London, UK. Current Status: Rofcanin, Y., Hoque, K. & Kiefer, T., targeted at *Journal of Management*.

flexitime practices are adopted, they are made available to the whole workforce (e.g. Kossek & Michel, 2011).

This study builds on fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001) to explore the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime. Fairness theory explains how individuals come to view events or situations (or in this case, procedures) as fair or unfair by focusing on the cognitive processes through which they evaluate whether and how an agent or decision maker is responsible for an event that has had a negative impact on them, i.e. accountable blame (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). For this theory to be applicable, there must be harm that has violated existing norms, and hence could and should have been prevented (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001).

Drawing on these tenets of fairness theory, this study makes two contributions. First, it explores the role of fairness in understanding why employees who are not entitled to flexitime are likely to show lower affective commitment toward their organization. While some emerging evidence (as outlined below) suggests that employees who are not entitled to flexitime report poorer outcomes, in terms of job satisfaction and affective commitment, than employees in the same workplace who are entitled to it (e.g. Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013), the extant literature has so far failed to explain why this might be the case. This study adds to the extant literature by exploring the role of employees' fairness perceptions as a mechanism accounting for the negative implications of the impact of non-entitlement to flexitime on employees' affective commitment. This focus on fairness perceptions is relevant and important because flexitime is a practice valued by employees (Kossek & Thompson, 2015), and its differential implementation across employees is therefore likely to raise perceptions of unfairness among those denied its benefits (Golden, 2007; Kossek et al., 2014).

Second, this study elaborates on the role of social context in understanding variations in the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and employees' overall fairness perceptions. It introduces the concept of "normativeness" of flexitime (Gajendran, Harrison & Delaney-Klinger, 2015), which relates to whether (and how many) other employees are entitled to flexitime in the same workplace. In a workplace where most employees are entitled to flexitime, and hence normativeness is high, employees who are deprived of it are arguably more likely

to question the fairness of their treatment, and thus react more negatively than employees in a workplace where only a few other employees are entitled to it so normativeness is low. The prevalence, or normativeness, of flexitime use in a workplace (Gajendran, Harrison & Delaney-Klinger, 2015) may influence the extent to which the effect of non-entitlement to flexitime has negative implications for employees' overall fairness perceptions and organizational commitment. This focus on normativeness is important and particularly novel, given that previous research on HR differentiation (Bal, van Kleef & Jansen, 2015; Bal et al., 2012; Bartel, Wrzesniewski & Wiesenfeld, 2012), and particularly flexitime (Thompson, Payne & Taylor, 2015), has treated the impact of social context as invariant. This study not only questions the static assumption of social context, but also accords it explanatory potency in influencing employee outcomes from a fairness perspective. This study used a large-scale employee survey (the British Workplace Employment Relations Study 2011) to test the hypotheses. Figure 3 presents the conceptual framework underpinning this study, and in the following sections the hypotheses are developed.




Figure 3: Conceptual framework of the study

5.1 Theoretical Overview and Development of Hypotheses

5.1.1 Non-entitlement to flexitime and affective commitment

Recent research on strategic HRM has identified a shift toward differentiated HR architecture which acknowledges the unique contributions of select groups of employees to organizational performance (Delery & Doty, 1996; Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Lepak & Snell, 2002). While the results of these studies support HR differentiation (Takeuchi, Chen & Lepak, 2009; Youndt & Snell, 2004), they have focused mainly on employees who are entitled to HR practices, overlooking the potential effects of HR differentiation on employees who are unentitled.

The few studies that have been undertaken on the effects of HR differentiation suggest that, by definition, differentiated HR practices benefit only those who are

entitled to them. Golden (2007) found that workers without access to telecommuting reported lower work satisfaction than their colleagues with such access, which in turn increased their intentions to quit. This reflects broader findings on the effects of differentiation of HR practices. For example, Marescaux, De Winne and Sels (2013) demonstrate that employees who felt they had less access to certain HR practices, in the form of receiving less training and development than their co-workers, showed considerably lower commitment than those with greater access. From a mutual gains perspective, Ogbonnaya et al. (2016) argue that non-entitlement to HR practices such as flexible work arrangements, career development and training opportunities signals to employees that they are less valued by the organization than entitled employees; hence, they will respond by showing lower levels of affective commitment. From the perspective of HR differentiation and drawing on recent empirical evidence, the first hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 1: Non-entitlement to flexitime is negatively associated with employees' affective commitment toward their organization.

5.1.2 A closer look at the overall fairness perception

This study builds on fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998) to identify the mechanism underpinning the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and employees' affective commitment. This theory proposes that individuals engage in counterfactual thinking following the experience of an unfavourable event or situation, which determines whether and to what degree they deem the event to be fair or unfair. This counterfactual thinking involves contrasting the current injurious experience with what they *would* have experienced had the event unfolded differently, and what *could* have happened if the decision maker had behaved differently (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001).

The “would” counterfactual establishes whether an individual would be better off if a given benefit such as flexitime were made available. This might be expected where flexitime is concerned, as it would enable the employee to align with and meet needs arising from the non-work domain and enjoy discretion over the timing of their work (e.g. Fassina, Jones & Uggerslev, 2008). This is likely to be the case especially in workplaces where some employees are entitled to flexitime while others are not. In such workplaces, non-entitled employees are likely to attribute

blame to managers who “could” have provided flexitime as they did for others; hence, there are negative consequences for these focal employees because a) there is a discrepancy between the alternative and current situations, and b) an alternative action is feasible and under the manager’s control, leading them to perceive their treatment as unfair. In work environments in which employees perceive their treatment to be unfair, they may make negative attributions of the lack of flexitime within their workplace (Nishii, Lepak & Schneider, 2008) where they do not feel motivated or catered for (Van De Voorde & Beijer, 2015). In attributing blame to the organization or its agent for their lack of entitlement to flexitime (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), such employees are likely to respond by showing lower affective commitment to the organization. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 2(a): Non-entitlement to flexitime is negatively associated with employees’ overall fairness perceptions.

Hypothesis 2(b): Employees’ overall fairness perceptions mediate the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and employees’ affective commitment to their organization.

5.1.3 The moderating role of normativeness of flexitime

In addition to the “would” and “could” counterfactuals, fairness theory identifies “should” as a third counterfactual which establishes what should have happened according to prevailing moral principles and standards (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). Employees who are not entitled to a given practice may rely on cues from their social environment to shape their interpretations of work events and whether alternative actions could have been taken (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). In the context of flexitime, if this is made widely available to other employees in the same workplace, it represents social information that indicates to non-entitled employees that the appropriate “standard” or “norm” is to provide flexitime (Gajendran, Harrison & Delaney-Klinger, 2015; Nicklin et al., 2011). The prevalence of flexitime also shows that it “could” have been possible for managers to have made this entitlement also available to them, had they wished to do so. As such, employees who are part of a small group of workers unentitled to flexitime are likely to attribute blame to their managers for not providing them with flexitime as

they do for others, and therefore feel unfairly treated. In contrast, when only a small proportion of employees are entitled to flexitime (in other words, when the norm in the workplace is for flexitime to be unavailable), unentitled employees are less likely to feel that their managers could have provided it because the norm is not to provide it. In such cases, they are unlikely to attribute blame to their managers, as they will perceive the entitlement to flexitime of one or a few employees as special cases arising out of particular needs, and will not feel unfairly treated.

Gajendran, Harrison and Delaney-Klinger's (2015) findings indirectly support these arguments. Focusing on employees entitled to telecommuting, these authors underline the importance of social context surrounding the use of differentiated telecommuting. In their study, the normativeness of telecommuting, which was reported by managers as the percentage of employees who telecommuted on a regular basis in a team, was used as a proxy for social context. Their findings reveal that telecommuting had a positive impact on employees' task performance when they were among a few who were exclusively entitled to this practice (in other words, when telecommuting normativeness was low). However, when telecommuting normativeness was high, entitlement to it had no effect on employees' task performance.

Focusing on employees who are not entitled to flexitime, it is anticipated that employees unentitled to flexitime will view their non-entitlement as normal when the normativeness of flexitime entitlement is low, and will therefore not perceive themselves as being treated unfairly because their managers could not and should not have provided them with flexitime. However, when the normativeness of entitlement to flexitime is high, non-entitled employees are more likely to perceive themselves as being treated unfairly because the managers could have and should have provided them with flexitime. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 3: Normativeness of flexitime moderates the negative association between non-entitlement to flexitime and employees' overall fairness perceptions, such that this association is stronger (weaker) when normativeness of flexitime is high (low).

5.2 Method

5.2.1 Research context and sample

The analysis of this study used linked employer–employee data from the 2011 British Workplace Employment Relations Study (WERS; see www.wers2011.info). WERS is designed to be nationally representative of British workplaces with five or more employees in all industry sectors except agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing, and mining and quarrying. It is widely regarded as a highly authoritative data source, sponsored by the British government, the Economic and Social Research Council, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service, and the Policy Studies Institute. Its main purpose is to provide a large and nationally representative dataset of workplaces concerning employee–employer relationships. Workplaces are defined as premises encompassing the activities of a single employer (Van Wanrooy et al., 2013), for example a bank branch. In each workplace, face-to-face interviews were conducted with the manager with primary responsibility for employee relations. The management survey, comprising 2,680 observations with a response rate of 46.5 per cent, enables the identification of control variables at the workplace level. The employee survey, based on self-completion questionnaires administered to a random sample of up to 25 employees in each workplace, enables the identification of variables for hypotheses and control variables at the individual level. The final WERS employee survey comprises responses from 21,981 employee surveys, with a response rate of 54.3 per cent from 1,922 workplaces.

Employee identification numbers (persid) were used to link employee and manager surveys. The sample was restricted to workplaces where variation was observed in the implementation of flexitime practices, thereby eliminating workplaces where everyone was either entitled or unentitled to flexitime practices (for 1,533 employees in 260 workplaces, none were entitled to flexitime; for 993 employees in 117 workplaces, all were entitled to flexitime). This resulted in a final sample of 19,454 employees and 1,545 workplaces (88 per cent of employees and 80 per cent of workplaces from the initial published data).

5.2.2 Measures

Entitlement to Flexitime: To measure flexitime, employees were asked whether they had used flexitime before or if it had been made available if they had needed it. Answer category 3 (“*not available to me*”) was re-coded into a new code of 0, representing non-entitlement to flexitime. Categories 1 (“*I have this arrangement*”) and 2 (“*available to me but I don’t use it*”) were re-coded into a new code of 1, representing entitlement to flexitime.

Normativeness of Flexitime: The normativeness of flexitime use was operationalized by calculating the percentage of employees who were entitled to flexitime in their workplace, using a combination of a macro formula and a code (for each unique workplace, count and sum functions: a count of 1, standing for those entitled to flexitime, divided by the sum of “unique individual codes”, standing for each employee in a workplace). Therefore, for each workplace, a normativeness index was created, ranging between 0 and 1, with values closer to 1 reflecting higher normativeness of flexitime. Workplaces with values of 0 and 1 were eliminated because the former meant that no one was entitled to flexitime, while the latter meant that everyone was entitled to flexitime.

Employees’ Overall Fairness Perceptions: Employees were asked to state the extent to which managers in that workplace treated employees fairly. For ease of interpretation, these were re-coded as 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

Employees’ Affective Commitment: In line with other studies that have drawn on WERS 2011 (Ogbonnaya et al., 2016), three items were used to measure employees’ affective commitment to their organization. They were asked to state the extent to which they shared the organization’s values, felt loyal to the organization, and were proud to tell people about the organization. For ease of interpretation, these were re-coded from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree (3 items; $\alpha = 0.85$).

Controls: In testing the hypotheses, control variables were included at the individual and workplace levels, which were selected in light of previous studies

on flexitime and affective commitment to organizations, and studies based on the WERS series (e.g. Conway & Sturges, 2014).¹⁰

5.2.3 Analysis strategy

Owing to the nested structure of the data, with employees (Level 1) nested within their workplaces (Level 2), multi-level regression modelling was used. MLwiN software was used to test the hypotheses (Rasbash et al., 2000). To determine whether multi-level analysis was appropriate, two steps were followed. First, deviance statistics were evaluated for the dependent variable. Two separate models for the dependent variable were built using random intercept modelling (Klein et al., 2000). The model at Level 1 did not involve nesting of employees in their workplaces. This model was then compared with the model at Level 2, which did involve such nesting. The deviance statistics demonstrated that the model at Level 2 fitted the data significantly better than the model at Level 1 ($\Delta -2 * \log = 1.241$, $p < 0.001$ for affective commitment).

Second, we calculated the ICC (1) for affective commitment and overall fairness to account for the extent of the total variance attributable to differences between workplaces (Level 2). The ICC (1) for affective commitment was $0.09/0.63 = 0.14$, meaning that 14 per cent of the overall variance in affective commitment could be attributed to differences between workplaces. The ICC (1) for overall fairness was $0.16/1.23 = 0.13$, meaning that 13 per cent of the overall variance in fairness could

¹⁰ The following controls were included at the employee level: gender (1 = male, 2 = female), age (1 = 16-19, 2 = 20-29, 3 = 30-39, 4 = 40-49, 5 = 50-59, 6 = 60-64, 7 = 65 or more), dependent children (1 = respondent had dependent children under the age of 18, 0 otherwise), workplace tenure (1 = less than a year, 2 = 1 to less than 2 years; 3 = 2 to less than 5 years; 4 = 5 to less than 10 years; 5 = 10 years or more), managerial status (1 = managers, 2 = professionals, 3 = non-managers), full-time versus part-time status (1 = permanent, 2 = temporary with no agreed end date, 3 = fixed period with an agreed end date), membership of trade union or association (1 = yes, 2 = no, but have been in the past, 3 = no, never have been a member), ethnicity (coded into 17 categories, e.g. 1 = British), and fixed/base wage (1 = mentioned, 0 = not mentioned). At the workplace level, the following control variables were included: workplace size, organization size (coded into 14 categories, e.g. 1 = 5 to 9), whether a single independent workplace or otherwise (1 = one of a number of different workplaces in the UK, 2 = single independent workplace, 3 = sole UK establishment of a foreign organization), national ownership (coded into 5 categories, e.g. UK owned/controlled), union recognition (1 = yes, 2 = no), the formal status of the organization (coded into 12 categories, e.g. 9 = public service agency), number of years the workplace has been in operation, socio-economic group (0 = not classified, otherwise coded into 9 categories, e.g. 40 = professional workers/employees), number of employees who are non-UK nationals (1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = don't know), number of male and female and non-UK national employees in managers' and senior officials' group, and major Standard Industrial Classification (2007).

be attributed to differences between workplaces. These results therefore supported the use of multi-level regression analysis.

The sample designs of the WERS depart from simple random sampling. Weighting adjustments are needed to account for the probability of selection of the respondent's workplace into the main management sample, the respondent's own probability of selection from the employee population of the workplace, and bias introduced as a result of employee non-response. Accordingly, the weighting procedures suggested by the WERS team were used for this study.¹¹ Specifically, in weighting the analyses, the variable *svyset serno [pweight= seqwtnrc – (seqwtnrc_apr13)]* was used from the raw dataset, where *seqwtnrc* is the employee weight variable and *serno* is the unique workplace identifier. Standardized weights were used, and the analyses included the weighted results. The weights were also scaled using the scaling option in MLwiN for standard errors and quantile estimates. This process, which only changes the standard errors, ensures that bias-corrected estimates with weighting provide accurate results.

5.3 Results

5.3.1 Preliminary analyses

Table 7 reports the mean, standard deviation, and correlations of the study variables.

Table 7: Means, standard deviations and correlations

	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1	Entitlement to Flexitime (0 = No; 1 = Yes)	0.38	0.48	n.a.			
2	Flexitime Differentiation	0.37	0.25	0.52**	n.a.		
3	Overall Fairness	3.45	1.11	0.11**	0.03**	n.a.	
4	Affective Commitment	3.83	0.79	0.09**	-0.02*	0.53**	(0.85)

Notes. n = 19,454 employees in 1,545 workplaces; * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001; reliabilities, where applicable, are shown along the diagonal in parentheses.

It should also be noted that the WERS research team took measures such as conducting pilot tests and dress rehearsals of items to ensure that items were the best representatives of their corresponding constructs, hence minimizing common method bias (CMB). Statistical analyses were also conducted in the present study to establish whether CMB was a problem (Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Podsakoff,

¹¹ Available online at: <http://www.wers2011.info/methodology/4587717348>.

2012).¹² Building on the findings and the various measures taken by the WERS team, it can be concluded that CMB was not an issue

The effect size accounted for by all control variables was estimated by calculating Singer and Willett's (2003) pseudo- R^2 statistic. The pseudo- R^2 estimate is the proportional reduction in residual variance when comparing two nested models. For employees' overall fairness perceptions, adding all employee-level control variables reduced between-level variance from 0.159 to 0.128, a pseudo- R^2 estimate of 17 per cent, and within-level variance from 1.065 to 1.036, a pseudo- R^2 estimate of two per cent. For employees' affective commitment, adding all employee-level control variables reduced between-level residual variance from 0.093 to 0.081, a pseudo- R^2 estimate of 13 per cent, and within-level residual variance from 0.543 to 0.530, a pseudo- R^2 estimate of two per cent.

For employees' overall fairness perceptions, adding all workplace-level control variables reduced between-level variance from 0.159 to 0.129, a pseudo- R^2 estimate of 19 per cent (within-person variance was unchanged). For employees' affective commitment, adding all workplace-level control variables reduced between-level residual variance from 0.093 to 0.074, a pseudo- R^2 estimate of 20 per cent (within-person variance was unchanged). See Appendix 1 for mean and standard deviation values for all control variables.

5.3.2 Hypothesis testing

Hypotheses 1 and 2(a) propose direct relationships, which were tested through multi-level regressions using Mlwin. Hypothesis 1 proposes that non-entitlement to flexitime is negatively related to employees' affective commitment toward the organization. The results support this hypothesis ($\gamma = -0.19$, $p < 0.001$). Hypothesis 2(a) proposes that non-entitlement to flexitime is negatively related to employees'

¹² First, a split-half reliability test was conducted, as suggested when single-item measures are used and the sample size is relatively large (Wanous, Reichers & Hudy, 1997). Accordingly, the data were split into two groups according to entitlement and non-entitlement to flexitime. In each group, the correlations between fairness and affective commitment were similar ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$ for entitlement group; $r = 0.56$, $p < 0.01$ for non-entitlement group). Second, a marker variable analysis was conducted (Lindell & Whitney, 2001) by subtracting the lowest positive correlation between self-report variables, considered as a proxy for CMB, from each correlation value. Each value was then divided by 1, the lowest positive correlation between self-report variables. The resulting correlation values reflect CMB-adjusted correlations. Large differences between unadjusted and CMB-adjusted correlations suggest that CMB is a problem. The absolute differences were relatively minimal, ranging between 0.01 and 0.005.

overall fairness perceptions. The results also support this hypothesis ($\gamma = -0.28$, $p < 0.001$; see Table 8, Model 1).

Hypothesis 2(b) is that employees' overall fairness perceptions mediate the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and affective commitment. MCMAM was adopted here,¹³ and an online tool developed by Selig and Preacher (2008) was used to calculate confidence intervals. Hypothesis 2(b) is supported, as the confidence intervals did not include the value of zero (95% CI = [0.109/0.091] for affective commitment). The mediation is partial, as the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime were still significant for employees' affective commitment when overall fairness perceptions were tested simultaneously ($\gamma = 0.08$, $p < 0.001$; see footnotes in Table 8 for details). This result emphasizes the role of overall fairness as an underlying mechanism between non-entitlement to flexitime and affective commitment toward the organization.

Table 8: Associations between non-entitlement to flexitime, overall fairness and affective commitment

	Overall Fairness			Affective Commitment		
	Model 1			Model 2		
Variable	Estimate	SE	t	Estimate	SE	t
Intercept	3.63	0.02	181.51	3.88	0.01	388
Non-entitlement to flexitime	-0.28	0.01	16.71***	-0.08	0.02	-4.00***
Overall fairness				0.36	0.006	60.00***
-2LL	55,874.66			36,986.92		
Δ in -2LL	1,102*** ^a			6,657*** ^b		
df	1			2		
Between-level variance and standard error	0.16	0.01		0.05	0.004	
Within-level variance and standard error	1.06	0.02		0.41	0.006	

Notes: ^a, ^b statistical comparison with an intercept-only model at Level 1 (not shown in the table). For all values, gamma coefficients, their corresponding standard error and t values are reported. The indirect effect is calculated using an online interactive tool that generates an R score (<http://quantpsy.org/medmc/medmc.htm>). The first path of the indirect relationship relates to the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness (-0.28, 0.01) and the second relates to the association between overall fairness and affective commitment (0.36, 0.006) when non-entitlement to flexitime is present in the equation; $n = 19,454$ employees in 1,545 workplaces; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

¹³ This method used simulations with 20,000 iterations, relying on a product-of-coefficients (ab) approach, where ab was the product of (a) the regression path between non-entitlement to flexitime and fairness perceptions, and (b) the regression path between fairness perceptions and affective commitment (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2007). The distribution of the product method (Preacher, 2015) was then used to calculate confidence intervals and validate the ab coefficients. When the confidence intervals do not contain zero, an indirect effect is established.

Hypothesis 3 proposes that normativeness of flexitime moderates the negative association between non-entitlement to flexitime and employees' fairness perceptions. In this regard, the interaction term between non-entitlement and normativeness of flexitime was significant, providing initial support for this hypothesis ($\gamma = 0.42$, $p < 0.001$; see Table 9, Model 2). See Figure 4 for the pattern of the interaction.

Table 9: Moderation of normativeness of flexitime on association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness

	Overall Fairness			Overall Fairness		
	Model 1			Model 2		
Variable	Estimate	S.E.	t	Estimate	S.E.	t
Intercept	3.63	0.02	181.51	3.66	0.02	183.01
Non-entitlement to flexitime	-0.29	0.02	-14.51***	-0.31	0.01	-31.01***
Normativeness of flexitime	-0.12	0.06	-2.01*	-0.31	0.07	-4.42***
Non-entitlement to flexitime * Normativeness of flexitime				0.42	0.08	5.25***
-2LL	55,870.65			55,843.97		
Δ in -2LL	1,106.19*** ^a			26.74***		
df	2			1		
Between-level variance and standard error	0.16	0.01		0.16	0.01	
Within-level variance and standard error	1.05	0.02		1.05	0.02	

Notes: ^a Statistical comparison with an intercept-only model at Level 1 (not shown in the table). For all values, gamma coefficients, their corresponding standard error and t values are reported; $n = 19$ employees in 1,545 workplaces; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.




Figure 4: Moderation of normativeness of flexitime on association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness

To interpret the meaning of this interaction, Dawson's unstandardized (2016) simple-slope analysis procedures were conducted at high, medium, and low levels of the mean value of the moderator, normativeness of flexitime. Under high conditions of normativeness of flexitime, the association between entitlement to flexitime and fairness was significant (gradient of simple slope = 0.11, t value of simple slope = 1.25, $p < 0.05$); at moderate levels of normativeness, the association was negative and significant (gradient of simple slope = -0.08, t value of simple slope = -1.51, $p < 0.05$); and at low levels of normativeness, it was negative and significant (gradient of simple slope = -0.13, t value of simple slope = -2.94, $p < 0.05$). These results mean that in workplaces where normativeness of flexitime is higher and moderate, non-entitled employees perceive their treatment as less fair. In workplaces where normativeness of flexitime is lower, non-entitled employees perceive their treatment as more fair. Hypothesis 3 is therefore supported.

5.4 Discussion

As a result of the dynamic nature of business environments and growing evidence that employees prefer to be treated individually in workplaces (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015), the use of flexitime is becoming more common in workplaces (World at Work, 2013), yet research to date has revealed an incomplete picture, focusing mainly on the impact of receiving entitlement to flexitime. This is surprising, given that “employees and employers often have mixed experiences with these practices” (Kossek & Thompson, 2015, p.2), and variations in its implementation within and across organizations have remained unexplored (Nishii & Wright, 2008). However, differentiation of HR practices may be a double-edged sword, as the presumed positive effects of such practices on those in receipt of them must be counterbalanced against the negative effects on the unentitled. Moreover, the impact of the work context has largely been considered to be invariant. This study has introduced two novel elements, employees' overall fairness perceptions and normativeness of flexitime, to explore the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime.

Role of overall fairness perceptions as a mechanism between non-entitlement to flexitime and affective commitment: Non-entitlement to flexitime has both direct (H1) and indirect influences (via overall fairness perceptions, H2a) on employees' affective commitment. These are the first results to shed light on the nature of the

relationship between non-entitlement to flexitime and employees' fairness perceptions, as well as the downstream consequences for employees' affective commitment toward their organization. Specifically, the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and affective commitment is mediated by employees' fairness perceptions, underlining their role as a crucial mechanism. Prevailing theories explaining the effects of workplace flexibility include job control, work–family role conflict, and boundary and border theories (Kossek & Thompson, 2015; Golden, 2007). While these theories are useful in providing an understanding of the effects of entitlement to flexitime, they are less able to explain the negative effects of not receiving flexitime in workplaces where others are in receipt of such benefits. In adopting fairness theory, this study therefore makes a theoretical contribution to the flexitime literature, enabling discussion of the mixed consequences of flexitime (Allen et al., 2013) while encouraging a focus on the drawbacks of flexitime (Kossek & Thompson, 2015).

From an HR differentiation perspective, previous researchers have argued that organizations gain from implementing HR practices differentially across groups of employees (Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Lepak & Snell, 2002). According to this perspective, certain HR practices should be reserved for groups of employees who, for example, are strategically valuable to the organization (Clinton & Guest, 2013), are most likely to drive organizational performance (Becker & Huselid, 2011), or have been identified as high performers or as having high potential (Gelens et al., 2013). However, this approach is not necessarily justified for the workforce as a whole. Differential implementation of HR practices raises questions regarding the implications for employees who are not provided with the same opportunities. Despite its importance, the research stream on HR differentiation (Lepak & Snell, 2002; Nishii & Wright, 2008) has overlooked the potentially negative implications of HR differentiation for unentitled employees, particularly in workplaces where such HR differentiation exists. This is important because, when employees are singled out for access to a form of HR practice which is made available to others at the same time, organizational performance is likely to deteriorate (Bal & Lub, 2015; Wright & McMahan, 2011). This research expands theorization on HR differentiation, such as career customization, workforce differentiation and human capital theories, by focusing on the reverse of the coin.

A few previous studies have explored how differentiation is beneficial to its recipients using theories of work adjustment (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015), social exchange (Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013) and high performance work systems (Ogbonnaya et al., 2016). Fairness theory may be an important angle from which to explore the downside of HR differentiation. This study's focus on overall fairness therefore brings a new perspective on the HR differentiation literature which may be useful in exploring the downside of such practices, especially in contexts where the norm is to provide differentiated HR practices for certain employees.

Normativeness of flexitime influencing the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and overall fairness perceptions. This study has found that normativeness of flexitime, as a social context and boundary condition, influences overall fairness perceptions emanating from non-entitlement to flexitime (H3). This adds value to recent research which has begun to focus on the prevalence of FWPs and their impact on employee outcomes: Focusing only on those who benefited from telecommuting, Gajendran, Harrison and Delaney-Klinger (2015) found that in workplaces where telecommuting normativeness was high, the intensity of telecommuting was positively associated with task performance, while Golden (2007) report that teleworking prevalence is negatively associated with co-worker satisfaction. The present study appears to be the first to question the assumption of an invariant workplace regarding the prevalence of flexitime.

Moreover, from a measurement perspective, previous research on flexitime has built on the implicit assumption that the implementation of flexitime is standardized both within a company and across most, if not all, employees (e.g. Baltes et al., 1999; Thompson, Payne & Taylor, 2014). Although these previous studies asked employees to indicate whether flexitime applied to them, the possibility that some employees within a workplace may be entitled to it while others are not, and the potentially negative implications of this for non-recipients, have not been taken into account. This might be viewed as a considerable omission. The present study goes beyond previous research, which has relied on either managers' or employees' reports of the proportion of employees or co-workers who telecommute (Gajendran et al., 2015; Golden, 2007) to calculate normativeness. In this study, for each

workplace, a percentage for prevalence of flexitime (i.e. normativeness) has been calculated, which is more objective than other measures of normativeness, and hence adds rigour to this research stream.

Considering the model as a whole, this research answers calls to focus on particular types of FWP (Chadwick, 2010; Kinnie et al., 2005; Paauwe, 2009). The aspects and implications of each FWP for outcomes are different and unique. It is likely that flexitime, flexi-location and taking leave to take care for the elderly or children operate differently, with unique antecedents as well as consequences (Allen et al., 2013; Kossek & Thompson, 2015). Nevertheless, researchers have only recently started to focus on particular types of FWP, namely telecommuting (Golden, 2011) and, to a certain extent, flexitime (Thompson & Aspinwall, 2009). Focusing solely on flexitime, this study contributes to this research stream by delineating the fairness implications of non-entitlement to flexitime and the role of normativeness of flexitime.

5.5 Limitations and Future Suggestions

This study's particular strengths include: 1) its use of a large, nationally representative dataset; 2) its rigorous measurement of normativeness of flexitime for each workplace; and 3) its use of a matched employee–employer, multi-level design to test the hypotheses. However, some limitations must be noted. The first is its cross-sectional nature. The creation of a dichotomous variable (entitlement/non-entitlement to flexitime) and the calculation of normativeness of flexitime might be considered as more objective measurement approach than subjective Likert scales (e.g. Bal et al., 2012). Moreover, the hypotheses of this study are in line with fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001) and empirical research showing that overall fairness is an important mediator and predictor of employee attitudes (Barclay & Kiefer, 2014). However, a longitudinal design might disentangle causal inferences.

A second limitation relates to the single-item measure for overall fairness. However, it should be noted that the WERS research team selected these items carefully and followed rigorous statistical methods and procedures to ensure that each item best represented its corresponding construct. Previous research also supports the use of single-item measures from WERS (e.g. Conway & Sturges,

2014), particularly for overall fairness (Colquitt & Rodell, 2015; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009).

Despite using a representative sample for the UK, the findings of this study may have been influenced by the cultural context, with a high degree of individualism and low power distance (House et al., 2004). In a cultural context in which collective goals are more important than individual goals (low individualism) and where hierarchy is important (high power distance), employees' lack of entitlement to flexitime might have different effects on work outcomes. Contrary to the findings of this study, following a standard work schedule in such business contexts might be appraised positively and rewarded by managers.

This study focused on a particular FWP – flexitime and integrated normativeness of flexitime – to explore the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime. Given that other types of FWPs, such as telecommuting, are different in nature from flexitime, it would be interesting to explore the extent to which normativeness of telecommuting influences (or not) the reactions of those who are not entitled to it.

This research has explored the effects of non-entitlement on employees' affective commitment toward their organization. Given the concern of managers to drive the work performance of employees (Allen et al., 2013), future research is suggested to explore whether and how non-entitlement to certain FWPs (such as flexitime) might influence individual and workplace performance.

5.6 Practical Implications

This study has revealed the effects of non-entitlement to flexitime on employees' fairness perceptions and affective commitment. The normativeness of flexitime in a workplace has been found to be important, influencing the association between non-entitlement to flexitime and employees' fairness perceptions. Therefore, its practical implications relate to minimizing the negative ramifications for employees who have no access to flexitime in a given workplace. It would be useful to outline the procedures and policies for eligibility to flexitime in the workplace. In workplaces where most employees work on flexitime, guidelines and procedures regarding how to use such practices should be stated explicitly, particularly for the small proportion of employees who are denied access to them (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). The presence of clear procedures and the timely delivery of information by

managers should justify not only why a focal employee is unentitled, but why others are provided with this form of flexibility.

5.7 Conclusion

Given the potential benefits of flexitime both for employees, in the form of increased availability for non-work demands during regular working hours and greater perceptions of control, and for employers, in terms of reduced overtime and less absenteeism, it is perhaps unsurprising that organizations worldwide are increasingly implementing flexitime. Despite the growing interest in flexitime due to its benefits, research to date has overlooked the reverse of the coin – the negative effects of not receiving flexitime in workplaces where others receive it. This study is among the first not only to integrate the fairness perceptions of employees who are excluded from flexitime, but also to provide an explanation by questioning the assumption of a static social context in the workplace. Caution is needed when differentiating flexitime practices between employees, particularly in workplaces where the extent of flexitime differentiation is high.

Chapter 6: General Discussion

In this thesis, the effects of HR differentiation have been discussed from the perspectives of both recipients (Studies 1 and 2) and non-recipients (Study 3), with empirical examination of a number of hypotheses across the three studies. Through these separate studies, diverse contributions have been made to theory and practice. These contributions, as well as the limitations of the studies and suggestions for future research, are discussed in this chapter.

6.1 Theoretical Contributions

6.1.1 Exploring the effects of HR differentiation from recipients' perspectives

The two studies on the effects of HR differentiation from recipients' perspectives have enhanced the conceptualization of i-deals by examining associations between managers' emotions about the i-deal negotiation process and employees' behaviours following i-deal negotiations (Study 1), and the mechanisms that explain associations between i-deal negotiations and employees' work performance in the long term (Study 2). Issues relating to the concept of i-deals have been raised in Chapter 2, and details of how the two studies on i-deals in this thesis address these issues are discussed below.

6.1.1.1 Disentangling the negotiation and attainment of i-deals

Previous research on HRM has distinguished between the availability and implementation of HR practices (Guest, 2011). This distinction is important, as there may be many reasons why available or promised HR practices may not materialize. For example, studies have revealed that re-structuring at the organizational level or changes in the objectives of the department may give rise to lapses between available and implemented HR practices. Adopting a similar approach, Bal and Dorenbosch (2015) differentiate between the availability and use of individualized HR practices. Their findings demonstrate the differential effects of availability versus use of individualized HR practices on employees' work engagement. This distinction remains under-explored in research on i-deals. Given that the benefits of i-deals are likely to arise out of their attainment, the studies in this thesis have taken a first step in mapping the concept of i-deals as a process comprising at least two steps: negotiation and attainment.

Study 1 has conceptually and empirically differentiated between negotiation and attainment of i-deals. Following the same approach to disentangling i-deals, the findings of Study 2 reveal that this differentiation is theoretically important because, unlike the assumptions and conceptualization of previous research, negotiation of i-deals does not influence the work performance of employees in the long term: it is the attainment of i-deals, above and beyond negotiation, that leads to enhanced work performance. This finding corroborates research on i-deals that has adopted a work adjustment perspective (e.g. Bal et al., 2012; Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015). A work adjustment perspective is plausible, given that the benefits of training, development and career opportunities are likely to provide employees with the necessary resources to perform well.

The conceptualization of i-deals as composed of negotiation and attainment contributes to recent discussions on the processual nature of i-deals. One core characteristic of i-deals is that they are explicitly negotiated between employees and their supervisors, resulting in agreements on altered employment arrangements (Liao, Wayne & Rousseau, 2016). While the process can be roughly divided into an initiation phase, a negotiation phase and an “aftermath” phase (Rousseau, 2005), the focus of studies to date has been on the negotiation and its effects on employees. Since different phases of i-deals may have different antecedents and outcomes, disentangling i-deals is crucial, as it may provide a more integrative picture of how such deals are ultimately obtained, and whether their effects on employee attitudes and behaviours emanate from negotiation or attainment.

6.1.1.2 The role of managers in the aftermath of i-deal negotiations

I-deals are negotiated in a dyadic relationship involving employees and their managers. Although i-deal negotiations are initiated by employees, it is managers who are ultimately responsible for their implementation; they hold the ultimate power to grant or withhold i-deals. Despite this theoretical acknowledgment (Rousseau, 2005), previous research has not explored how and why managers might facilitate the attainment of negotiated i-deals for their subordinates. Taking a first step, Study 1 has revealed that successfully negotiated i-deals may not always be implemented. The role of managers, and particularly their emotions about employees’ most recent i-deal negotiations, determine the extent to which

successfully negotiated i-deals are obtained. Given that i-deals differentiate the working conditions of co-workers in a team context, their provision is likely to deviate from existing HR standards and practices applicable to everyone else. For this reason, the provision of i-deals for a select group of employees may impede team functioning and undermine managers' responsibilities. It is therefore plausible that managers may feel anxious, stressed or unhappy if they infer that, having obtained i-deals, focal employees may not share their benefits with team members.

Conversely, managers may feel happy and content if they infer that i-deals are likely to contribute to team cohesion and effectiveness, beyond the focal employee who obtains a deal. This may be achieved if the i-deal recipients share their benefits with team members, such as benefits arising from new training, workshops, career growth or other developmental opportunities.

6.1.1.3 Employees' intentions in negotiating i-deals

A defining element of i-deals is that they are intended to be beneficial for teams, beyond the focal employee and the manager (Rousseau, 2005). One way to explore this assumption is by observing recipients' behaviours following i-deal negotiations. Study 1, adopting a sub-scale of socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours of employees (e.g. Kiefer & Barclay, 2012), has underlined that engaging in socially connecting behaviours, such as helping colleagues, following i-deal negotiations makes managers feel positive. In contrast, employees' engagement in socially disconnecting behaviours following i-deal negotiations makes managers feel negative. How managers feel about employees' i-deal negotiations determines the extent to which successfully negotiated i-deals are implemented. The findings of Study 1 contribute to an understanding of the goals of employees in asking for i-deals, whether they use them in a way that benefits only themselves or also co-workers in a team context. This finding opens new avenues to explore whether or not employees, having obtained i-deals, actually share their benefits with co-workers (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). More broadly, this study underlines that i-deals do not unfold in a dyadic vacuum, and that the broader social context of managers and co-workers is important in this process.

6.1.1.4 Differentiating between types of i-deal

Previous studies have tended to lump together different types of i-deal (e.g. Ng & Feldman, 2015), despite empirical evidence (Rosen et al., 2013) and conceptual discussions arguing that they differ (Bal et al., 2012). For example, the process through which flexibility i-deals affect employee outcomes may be different from the process through which developmental i-deals affect employee outcomes. The former is about flexibility regarding when and how employees work, whereas the latter is about career developmental opportunities provided to employees (Bal & Rousseau, 2015).

Study 2 has tested and explored the effects of both types of i-deal simultaneously, revealing different patterns with regard to the effects of developmental and flexibility i-deals on employees' work performance. As discussed in Study 2, flexibility i-deals may influence employees' non-work domains through other mechanisms, such as influencing first family and then work performance. Although Study 2 did not test relevant mechanisms for how flexibility i-deals may influence employee outcomes, it has opened up new research areas to differentiate types of i-deal and explore relevant theoretical frameworks that might be used to explain their differential effects. For example, as revealed in previous research, the theoretical framework of work adjustment theory (Baltes et al., 1999) may explain why developmental i-deals influence work performance positively, while frameworks within which to understand how flexibility i-deals may influence work outcomes might include theories on work–family interference, such as the Work–Home Resources Model (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).

6.1.1.5 Employees' positive emotions as lynchpins between negotiated and obtained i-deals

Focusing exclusively on the aftermath of i-deal negotiations, previous research has delineated how job characteristics such as autonomy, task significance (Hornung et al., 2010) and task complexity mediate the relationship between i-deal negotiations and employee outcomes. Taking an affect-driven approach, Study 2 has underlined the role of employees' positive emotions in explaining how successfully negotiated i-deals are obtained. This is important, given the role of positive emotions in sustaining behaviours and achieving goals in challenging and uncertain contexts, such as requests for i-deals. Positive emotions have an adaptive role and encourage

employees experiencing these emotions to take advantage of the encountered opportunities and deal with uncertainty most effectively (Ilies & Judge, 2005; Tiedens & Linton, 2001). The adaptive role of positive emotions is also emphasized in the negotiation literature: experiencing positive emotions is argued to be an important mechanism for translating negotiation into attainment (Kopelman et al., 2006). From a broader HRM perspective, employees' positive display of emotions may indicate how they make sense of and experience HR practices (Maitlis & Ozcelik, 2004).

6.1.1.6 Contributions to HR differentiation

The findings of Studies 1 and 2 contribute to debates on how differentiation of HR practices influences its recipients and unfolds more broadly in organizations. The focus of strategic HRM has been on team or organizational levels (Datta, Guthrie & Wright 2005), and few recent studies have adopted a cross-level approach to explore the effects of macro-level (e.g. team or organizational) HR practices on employee outcomes (e.g. Kehoe & Wright, 2013; Snape & Redman, 2010). Therefore, the essence of differentiated HR practices, which is the focal employee, has been overlooked. From this angle, as i-deals are examples of differentiated HR practices, the two studies contribute to research on HR differentiation by highlighting its positive effects on employees' work performance and by exploring the role of managers' emotions and employees' behaviours in understanding the circumstances under which deals are granted to focal employees.

Recent research on HR differentiation has begun to show that differentiated HR practices contribute to organizational performance and growth (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015) and drive employees' affective commitment to organizations (Marescaux et al., 2013). However, there is still a lack of research on the role of managers in implementing differentiated HR practices. A recent study by Bal et al. (2015) demonstrates the moderating role of managerial support in the relationship between mass career customization and attitudinal outcomes, including affective commitment and work engagement. However, mass career customization, as the name denotes, refers to the customization of career arrangements for *all* employees, not a select group. Since managers are primary agents in modifying HR practices

to suit employees' needs and preferences, as in the case of i-deals, exploring their role in this process is particularly crucial.

Research on the antecedents of HR differentiation is also lacking. By its nature, providing a select group of employees with differentiated HR practices may hamper team cohesion; therefore, managers must be aware of the consequences of providing differentiated HR practices. Taking a first step, the findings in Study 1 have revealed that employees who engage in socially connecting behaviours are more likely to obtain i-deals than employees who engage in socially disconnecting behaviours. These findings provide information on the goals of employees in requesting differentiated HR practices, and respond to recent calls for research exploring the triggers that lead employees to seek individualized work arrangements from their managers or HR departments (Guest, 2011).

Finally, the findings of the two studies complement and respond to calls for research to explore contingent factors in the effects of HR differentiation on employee outcomes. For example, research to date has focused on age (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015), job level (Clinton & Guest, 2013), climate (Bal et al., 2012) and the nature of HR practices, such as economic versus social resources (Marescaux et al., 2013), to explore the effects of differentiated HR practices on employee outcomes. The results of Study 1 have shown that managers' positive emotions about employees' i-deal negotiations are a contingent condition facilitating the attainment of such deals. Moreover, how employees feel following successfully negotiated i-deals also explains the attainment of i-deals and improvements in work performance, as shown in Study 2.

A common thread of research on HR differentiation is the differing effects of flexibility-oriented versus career- and developmental-oriented HR practices on employees' behaviours and attitudes (Ogbonnaya et al., 2016). This pattern is observed and supported by the two studies, revealing that task and work responsibility i-deals are more frequently requested and obtained by employees than flexibility i-deals, and that the former influence work performance significantly, whereas the latter do not.

6.1.2 Exploring the effects of HR differentiation from non-recipients' perspectives

Turning to the downside of differentiated HR practices, the findings of Study 3 have revealed that non-entitlement to flexitime negatively influences the overall fairness perceptions of employees, leading to lower affective commitment. This finding contributes to a growing body of research addressing the question of why employees who are deprived of certain HR practices react negatively; for example, why do non-users of such HR practices have less satisfaction with their jobs (Golden, 2007) or show lower affective commitment to their organizations (Marescaux et al., 2013)? This finding also responds to recent reviews of HRM which explicitly identify a need for the integration of justice into HR differentiation research (Gelens et al., 2013).

As previously discussed, differentiating between a select group of employees in terms of providing specific HR practices may be reasonable from a strategic point of view, for example in terms of the resource-based view and workforce differentiation (Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Morton, 2005) and human capital theory (Lepak & Snell, 1999). However, HR differentiation creates inequality among employees, raising issues for non-recipients. Employees tend to compare their treatment with that of others in the same team, and tend to react negatively when treated differently from others, (Paauwe, 2009). While researchers have explored career management (Crawshaw, 2006) and performance evaluation management (Farndale et al., 2011) from a fairness perspective, research on HR differentiation has failed to address fairness. This study is a first response to calls for research introducing and delineating the role of overall fairness in the differentiation of HR practices.

With regard to the effects of normativeness of flexitime, beyond its contribution to research on HR differentiation, this study contributes to debates on contingency perspectives on HR (Kaufman & Miller, 2011; Purcell, 1999). A key argument of the contingency perspective is that providing employees with a wider range of HR practices may not necessarily lead to desirable behaviours and attitudes. Approaching this argument from a different angle, a relevant question is whether non-entitlement to flexitime is always bad. This notion has been challenged by the findings of Study 3, which have clearly revealed that a contingency approach is

necessary to understand the link between exclusion from certain HR practices and the impact on employees' affective commitment. The findings concerning the importance of the prevalence of flexitime in workplaces open new avenues for research on HR differentiation, particularly for studies that adopt a contingency approach (e.g. Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015; Marescaux et al., 2013).

From the perspective of a focus exclusively on flexitime, this study complements recent research on debates that HR practices are not necessarily complementary, particularly flexible work practices such as flexi-location and compressed working hours (Thompson, Payne & Taylor, 2015). Indeed, in focusing solely on flexitime, this study contributes to a body of research that argues that each HR practice is likely to have unique and largely opposing effects on employee outcomes (Bryson & White, 2008; Kalmi & Kauhanen, 2008), and that their independent properties should be taken into account when exploring how they relate to these outcomes (Ogbonnaya et al., 2016; Thompson, Payne & Taylor, 2015).

6.2 General Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

In addition to the limitations of each study reported earlier, some limitations relate to the overall approach of this thesis.

First, conclusions drawn about the up- and downsides of HR differentiation have been based on i-deals for the former and flexitime practices for the latter. A more complete approach would draw on the same type of differentiated HR practice, i.e. i-deals, to explore both sides at the same time. Owing to resource constraints, the third study was not conducted on i-deals, and instead drew on WERS 2011 data. In addition to resource constraints, it would have been difficult to elicit fairness perceptions from employees who were not entitled to i-deals in workplaces where others had them. The design of such a study is challenging because there is as yet no consensus on what constitutes i-deals. Moreover, although the theory of i-deals presumes that they are transparent and openly negotiated, recipients may keep their i-deals secret, which not only raises privacy issues, but makes it difficult to capture co-workers' perceptions of their own or others' i-deals (Marescaux et al., 2015). With this limitation in mind, future research might explore the potential negative effects of i-deals on co-workers and on team effectiveness. I-deals are theorized to be beneficial not only for the recipient but also for co-workers and for the work

team (Rousseau, 2005). However, the potentially negative reactions of co-workers who are not entitled to i-deals in a team where others have them might outweigh the benefits of i-deals for their recipients, eventually hampering team effectiveness.

A second limitation relates to the conceptualization of the downside of HR differentiation practices. Regarding i-deals, the downside might be not obtaining i-deals that have been successfully negotiated, similar to a breach of psychological contract. The negative effects of not obtaining i-deals may outweigh the positive effects of negotiating them. However, insufficient data were available on employees who had successfully negotiated but were unable to obtain i-deals. This was due mainly to the study's focus on exploring the potential positive effects of i-deals on recipients' work performance. By integrating a psychological contract perspective, future research might explore the consequences of not obtaining negotiated i-deals for the focal employee and for the employer. In particular, as discussed in recent research, i-deals might be viewed as a unique form of psychological contract, where promises and their breach might be more salient for the focal employee and the employer (Guerrero & Bentein, 2015).

A third limitation relates to debate on whether types of i-deal have unique and independent effects, and whether their unique properties need to be taken into account when studying i-deals (Study 1). For example, flexibility i-deals may be more relevant to employees' family domain (which was not tested in the studies of this thesis), while task and responsibility i-deals may be more relevant to the work domain. Future research is needed to differentiate the unique effects of different types of i-deal by adopting relevant theoretical frameworks and measures.

A fourth limitation relates to the sample context. Across the three studies, the unique cultural contexts of Turkish and British samples have been discussed. For example, paternalism is a predominant cultural value in Turkish business settings, while individualism is a predominant characteristic of British business settings (House et al., 2004). Given the absence of a culture-related variable in these three studies, it is difficult to attribute differences in the findings to cultural contexts. This limitation therefore renders generalization of the findings difficult. As suggested for HR differentiation research (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015), studies need to account

for how and why culture influences the effective implementation of HR practices and their effects on employees.

Across the three studies, some micro and cognitive psychological mechanisms were not explicitly tested, such as attributions in Study 1, signalling functions of i-deals and employees' emotions in Study 2, and counterfactual thinking processes (would, should and could) in Study 3. However, given the studies' reliance on these theories as overarching frameworks, this approach does not pose serious threats to the conclusions of these studies.

The underlying assumption of HR differentiation is that the provision of such practices is intended to be mutually beneficial to the focal employee and the employer. In this thesis, the effects of HR differentiation have been explored from the perspective of recipients. However, from an employer's perspective, the meaning and processes through which HR differentiation unfolds in an organization will be different. For example, Study 2 has revealed that the recipients of i-deals show enhanced work performance. However, from an organizational perspective, the provision of i-deals may entail costs that may not be offset by the enhanced performance of focal employees, rendering these i-deals ineffective, and hence not mutually beneficial. Similarly, Study 3 has revealed that non-entitlement to flexitime is negatively associated with the affective commitment of employees who are excluded from it, and that this negative influence is stronger in workplaces where the percentage of differentiation is higher. From an organizational perspective, the negative reactions of excluded employees may not be crucial if the work is completed effectively, irrespective of the percentage of differentiation that prevails in a workplace. These scenarios raise the possibility that the motives and priorities of employers may be different from those of employees regarding HR differentiation, which might be investigated in future studies.

6.3 Methodological Strengths and Weaknesses

The specific strengths and weaknesses of each study have been discussed in their corresponding chapters. This section focuses on general methodological strengths and weaknesses.

Quantitative methods have been used to address the research questions of this thesis. As such, an implicit aim has been to contribute to research on HR

differentiation by adopting a rigorous design for each study. A first strength is the deployment of an advanced research design for the study of i-deals. In designing this research, it was important to determine whether a cross-sectional or longitudinal design would be better to tackle the research questions, to define the time frame and operationalization of the variables, and to include third parties, such as managers. Each of these points is discussed below.

First, disentangling i-deals and exploring their differential effects on employee outcomes requires a longitudinal design. However, i-deals research appears to have been dominated by cross-sectional designs (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015). In order to disentangle i-deals and explore the mechanisms through which negotiation of i-deals relates to work performance in the long term, Studies 1 and 2 adopted a longitudinal design, separated by six months.

Second, it was necessary to decide on an appropriate time frame for the longitudinal design. Specifically, determining an appropriate interval between waves one and two was not a straightforward task, particularly since previous research on i-deals offers no clear indication. Adopting a similar approach to that of research on psychological contracts (Ng & Feldman, 2008), an interval of six months was chosen, during which the effects of negotiated i-deals on performance outcomes could be observed. This time frame has also been suggested to be appropriate for research using working-student samples (Demerouti, Bakker & Halbesleben, 2014).

Third, this study utilized data from other sources, namely managers' evaluations of their own emotions concerning employees' i-deals (Study 1) and subordinates' work performance (Study 2). Multiple sources are important in order to eliminate common method bias, and to add to the rigour of previous studies, which have not integrated managers' ratings into i-deals research. Beyond the methodological contribution, the inclusion of managers' emotions about employees' i-deal negotiations emphasizes the role of managers in facilitating the attainment of i-deals. Moreover, the use of managers' evaluations of employees' work performance enhances objectivity in the evaluation of work performance concerning i-deals.

In terms of the analytical approach, this thesis adopted the strongest methods possible to test the hypotheses. Before the fieldwork for Studies 1 and 2 commenced, the content of items was discussed with full-time faculty members. A pilot test involving PhD students was then carried out to detect any problems in relation to comprehension of the survey items. Following these suggestions, the final surveys were adjusted and back-translated (Prieto, 1992). To evaluate the content validity of scales, various confirmatory factor analyses were carried out for all studies. Since Study 3 used an existing, cross-sectional dataset, various statistical tests were conducted to rule out common method bias. The collaborative efforts of the WERS team, as discussed in Study 3, ensured strict rigour and minimized common method bias as far as possible.

Study 3 also adopted an innovative approach to testing the effects of normativeness of flexitime. In particular, a normativeness index was calculated using a macro code, which calculated the prevalence of flexitime across workplaces where there was differentiation. Extending most recent research (Gajendran, Harrison & Delaney-Klinger, 2014), this study is believed to be the first to rely either on managers' reports concerning the prevalence of flexi-location or on co-workers' reports (Golden, 2007).

Because of the nested structure of data in all three studies, in testing for associations, multilevel regression analyses using MLwiN were carried out to eliminate problems that might arise from interdependence (Hox, 2002; Nezlek, 2001; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). Controlling for critical variables across all three studies also strengthened the findings.

6.4 Practical Implications

The studies presented in this thesis have important practical implications. Organizations are increasingly using differentiated HR practices to attract and retain employees (Call, Nyberg & Thatcher, 2015), and employees are becoming more concerned about their unique work needs (Michaels, Handfield-Jones & Axelrod, 2001). The findings therefore offer important practical guidelines for managers and HR departments.

A first practical implication emerging from Studies 1 and 2 is that managers and HR departments must acknowledge that negotiation for and attainment of

differentiated HR practices are separate. What is negotiated may not be obtained, and procedures on how to manage both steps effectively, as well as training managers to deliver what is promised, should be a focus in organizations.

This thesis offers evidence that it is not the negotiation of i-deals but their attainment that relates to enhanced work performance in the long term. Hence, i-deals might be used as strategic HRM tools by managers and HR departments to drive employees' work performance. It should be noted that different types of i-deal may influence different types of employee outcome. Hence, in deciding which type of i-deal to provide, managers and HR departments should take into account the needs of employees. With regard to the provision of i-deals, managers might examine employees' behaviours following i-deal negotiations for cues regarding their intentions in seeking and using these i-deals.

In addition to the potential benefits to the recipients of individualized HRM practices, an important implication concerns employees who are excluded from differentiated HR practices, especially in work contexts where others are entitled to them. As revealed in Study 3, non-entitlement to flexitime negatively influences employees' affective commitment, both directly and through their fairness perceptions. Moreover, social context plays an important role, influencing and shaping the degree to which non-entitled employees perceive their treatment to be unfair, reflected in lower affective commitment. An important way to tackle this undesirable result is to provide explicit guidelines and conduct open communications with employees regarding why they are not entitled to flexitime while others in the same workplace are, as reflected in normativeness of flexitime. Related research (Den Hartog et al., 2013) has found that managers' communication is crucial in this process, and procedures, guidelines and open communications by managers may help reduce grievances among employees who are unentitled to flexitime.

6.5 Summary and Conclusion

This thesis has aimed to explore the effects of HR differentiation from both recipients' and non-recipients' perspectives. In terms of unique theoretical contributions, the concept of i-deals and how they unfold in a social context have been discussed and supported by Studies 1 and 2. A finer-grained understanding of

the role of employees' behaviours following i-deal negotiations, managers' emotions about employees' i-deal negotiations, employees' positive emotions and the attainment of i-deals are conceived to be critical to understanding how i-deals unfold. With regard to the effects of HR differentiation on non-recipients, in Study 3, the role of overall fairness perceptions and the normativeness of flexitime have been introduced and discussed, which constitute unique theoretical contributions to the literature on flexitime and the downside of HR differentiation.

The knowledge developed in this thesis should stimulate further research and improve practice in organizations regarding the implementation of differentiated HR practices and their effects on employee performance. Caution is needed in differentiating these practices for certain employees, as perceptions of overall fairness among non-entitled employees and the degree of differentiation of such practices in the workplace may negatively influence employees' affective commitment.

Bibliography

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, pp.267-99.
- Aguinis, H. & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 451-74.
- Alfes, K., Truss, C., Soane, E. C., Rees, C. & Gatenby, M. (2013). The relationship between line manager behavior, perceived HRM practices, and individual performance: Examining the mediating role of engagement. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 52(6), 839-59.
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 414-35.
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M. & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(2), 345-76.
- Ambrose, M. L. & Arnaud, A. (2005). Distributive and procedural justice: Construct distinctiveness, construct interdependence, and overall justice. In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt (eds), *The Handbook of Organizational Justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 59-84.
- Ambrose, M. L. & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 491-500.
- Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C. & Rousseau, D. M. (2010). Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5), 970-88.
- Arthur, J. B. & Boyles, T. (2007). Validating the human resource system structure: A levels-based strategic HRM approach. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(1), 77-92.

- Aycan, Z., Shyns, B., Sun, J., Felfe, J. & Saher, N. (2013). Convergence and divergence of paternalistic leadership: A cross-cultural investigation of prototypes. *International Journal of Business Studies*, 44(9), 962-69.
- Baird, L. & Meshoulam, I. (1988). Managing two fits of strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1), 116-28.
- Bakker, A. B. & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2013). Weekly work engagement and flourishing: The role of hindrance and challenge job demands. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 397-409.
- Bakker, A. B., Tims, M. & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations*, 65(10), 1359-78.
- Bal, P. M., de Jong, S. B., Jansen, P. G. W. & Bakker, A. B. (2012). Motivating employees to work beyond retirement: A multi-level study of the role of i-deals and unit climate. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(2), 306-31.
- Bal, P. M. & de Lange, A. H. (2015). From flexibility human resource management to employee engagement and perceived job performance across the lifespan: A multisample study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(1), 126-54.
- Bal, P. M. & Dorenbosch, L. (2015). Age-related differences in the relations between individualized HRM and organizational performance: A large-scale employer survey. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25, 41-61.
- Bal, P. M. & Kooij, D. (2011). The relations between work centrality, psychological contracts, and job attitudes: The influence of age. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(4), 497-523.
- Bal, P.M., Kooij, D. T. A. M. & De Jong, S. B. (2013). How do developmental and accommodative HRM enhance employee engagement and commitment? The role of psychological contract and SOC-strategies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(4), 545-72.
- Bal, P. M. & Lub, X. D. (2015). Individualization of work arrangements: A contextualized perspective on the rise and use of i-deals. In P. M. Bal & D.

- M. Rousseau (eds), *Idiosyncratic Deals between Employees and Organizations: Conceptual Issues, Applications and the Role of Co-workers*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis Group, pp.52-65.
- Bal, P. M. & Rousseau, D. M. (2015). *Idiosyncratic Deals between Employees and Organizations: Conceptual Issues, Applications and the Role of Co-workers*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bal, P. M., van Kleef, M. V. & Jansen, P. G. (2015). The impact of career customization on work outcomes: Boundary conditions of manager support and employee age. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(3), 421-40.
- Baltes, B. B., Briggs, T. E., Huff, J. W., Wright, J. A. & Neuman, G. A. (1999). Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 496-513.
- Barclay, L. J. & Kiefer, T. (2014). Approach or avoid? Exploring overall justice and the differential effects of positive and negative emotions. *Journal of Management*, 40(7), 1857-98.
- Barsade, S. G. & Gibson, D. E. (2007). Why does affect matter in organizations? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 36-59.
- Bartel, C. A, Wrzesniewski, A. & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (2012). Knowing where you stand: Physical isolation, perceived respect, and organizational identification among virtual employees. *Organization Science*, 23(3), 743-57.
- Baruch, Y. (1999). Response rate in academic studies: A comparative analysis. *Human Relations*, 52(4), 421-38.
- Bauer, D. J., Preacher, K. J. & Gil, K. M. (2006). Conceptualizing and testing random indirect effects and moderated mediation in multilevel models: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 11(2), 142-63.
- Beal, D. J. & Weiss, H. M. (2003). Methods of ecological momentary assessment in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(4), 440-64.

- Beal, D., Weiss, H., Barros, E. & MacDermid, S. (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1054-68.
- Becker, T. E., Atinc, G., Breugh, J. A., Carlson, K. D., Edwards, J. R., & Spector, P. E. (2016). Statistical control in correlational studies: 10 essential recommendations for organizational researchers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(2), 157-67.
- Becker, B. E. & Huselid, M. A. (2006). Strategic human resource management: Where do we go from here? *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 898-925.
- Becker, B. E. & Huselid, M. A. (2011). Bridging micro and macro domains: Workforce differentiation and strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 37(2), 421-28.
- Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A. & Beatty, R. W. (2009). *The Differentiated Workforce*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Belogolovsky, E. & Bamberger, P. (2014). Signaling in secret: Pay for performance and the incentive and sorting effects of pay secrecy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6), 1706-33.
- Benko, C. & Weisberg, A. (2007). *Mass Career Customization: Aligning the Workplace with Today's Nontraditional Workforce*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Bies, R. J. & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lweicki, B. H. Sheppard & M. H. Bazerman (eds), *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp.43-45.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bos-Nehles, A. (2010). The line makes the difference: Line managers as effective HR partners. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Twente, The Netherlands.

- Boselie, P., Dietz, G. & Boon, C. (2005). Commonalities and contradictions in research on human resource management and performance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15(3), 67-81.
- Bowen, D. E. & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of “strength” of the HRM system. *The Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 203-21.
- Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. (2008). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*, 3rd ed., Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Briner, R. B. & Kiefer, T. (2005). Research into the experience of emotion at work: Definitely older, but are we any wiser? In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. Hartel & W. Zerbe (eds), *The Effect of Affect in Organizational Settings: Research on Emotion in Organizations*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press, pp.55-7.
- Brisco, J. P. & Hall, D. T. (2006). The interplay of boundaryless and protean careers: Combinations and implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(1), 4-18.
- Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording of translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner and J. W. Berry (eds), *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp.137-64.
- Brown, W. M. & Consedine, N. S. (2004). Just how happy is the happy puppet? An emotion signaling and kinship theory perspective on the behavioral phenotype of children with Angelman syndrome. *Medical Hypotheses*, 63(3), 377-85.
- Browne, W. J. (2003). *MCMC Estimation in MLwiN*. London: Institute of Education.
- Bryson, A. & White, M. (2008). Organizational commitment: Do workplace practices matter? Discussion Paper No. 881, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics.

- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural Equation Modeling with Amos: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(2), 169-98.
- Call, M. L., Nyberg, A. J. & Thatcher, S. M. B. (2015). Stargazing: An integrative conceptual review, theoretical reconciliation, and extension for star employee research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3), 623-40.
- Carmeli, A. & Spreitzer, G. M. (2009). Trust, connectivity, and thriving: Implications for innovative behaviors at work. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 43(3), 27-49.
- Chadwick, C. (2010). Theoretic insights on the nature of performance synergies in human resource systems: Toward greater precision. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 85-101.
- Chang, S., Gong, Y., Way, S. A. & Jia, L. (2013). Flexibility-oriented HRM systems, absorptive capacity, and market responsiveness and firm innovativeness. *Journal of Management*, 39(7), 1924-51
- Chesley, N. & Moen, P. (2006). When workers care: Dual-earner couples' caregiving strategies, benefit use, and psychological well-being. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(9), 1248-69.
- Chung, W. & Kalnins, A. (2001). Agglomeration effects and performance: A test of the Texas lodging industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(10), 969-88.
- Clinton, M. & Guest, D. E. (2013). Testing universalistic and contingency HRM assumptions across job levels. *Personnel Review*, 42(5), 529-51.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Collings, D. G. & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(4), 304-13.

- Collins, A. M., Cartwright, S. & Hislop, D. (2013). Homeworking: Negotiating the psychological contract. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(2), 211-25.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H. & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-45.
- Colquitt, J. A. & Rodell, J. B. (2015). Measuring justice and fairness. In R. S. Cropanzano & J. B. Rodell (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.187-202.
- Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A. & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3), 501-28.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D. & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39-67.
- Conway, N. & Coyle-Shapiro, J. (2015). Not so i-deal: A critical review of idiosyncratic-deals theory and research. In P.M. Bal & D.M. Rousseau (eds), *Idiosyncratic Deals between Employees and Organizations: Conceptual Issues, Applications, and the Role of Coworkers*. London: Psychology Press, pp.25-37.
- Conway, N. & Sturges, J. (2014). Investigating unpaid overtime working among the part-time workforce. *British Journal of Management*, 25(4), 755-71.
- Crawshaw, J. R. (2006). Justice source and justice content: Evaluating the fairness of organisational career management practices. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), 98-120.
- Curhan, J. R., Elfenbein, H. A. & Xu, H. (2006). What do people value when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(3), 493-512.

- Dalton, D. R. & Mesch, D. J. (1990). The impact of flexible scheduling on employee attendance and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(2), 370-87.
- Dany, F., Guedri, Z. & Hatt, F. (2008). New insights into the link between HRM integration and organizational performance: The moderating role of influence distribution between HRM specialists and line managers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(11), 2095-112.
- Datta, D. K., Guthrie, J. P. & Wright, P. M. (2005). Human resource management and labor productivity: Does industry matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1), 135-45.
- Dawson, J. (2016). Interpreting interaction effects. Available from: <http://www.jeremydawson.com/slopes.htm>.
- De Cremer, D., Van Dijke, M. & Mayer, D. M. (2010). Cooperating when “You” and “I” are treated fairly: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1121-33.
- De Lange, A. H., Taris, T. W., Jansen, P., Kompier, M. A. J., Houtman, I. L. D. and Bongers, P. M. (2010). On the relationships among work characteristics and learning-related behavior: Does age matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(7), 925-50.
- De Leede, J., Looise, J. C. & Van Riemsdijk, M. (2004). Collectivism versus individualism in Dutch employment relations. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 14(1), 25-39.
- De Melo, C. M., Carnevale, P. J., Read, S. J. & Gratch, J. (2013). Reading people’s minds from emotion expressions in interdependent decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106(1), 73-88.
- Delery, J. E. (1998). Issues of fit in strategic human resource management: Implications for research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 8(3), 289-310.
- Delery, J. E. & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic contingency and configurational

performance predictions. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802-35.

Delery, J. E. & Shaw, J. D. (2001). The strategic management of people in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and extension. In M. R. Buckley, J. R. B. Halbesleben & A. R. Wheeler (eds), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Vol. 20. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing, pp.165-97.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B. & Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2015). Productive and counterproductive job crafting: A daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 457-69.

Demerouti, E. & Rispens, S. (2014). Improving the image of student-recruited samples: A commentary. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 34-41.

Den Dulk, L. & de Ruijter, J. (2008). Managing work-life policies – disruption versus dependency arguments: Explaining managerial attitudes towards employee utilization of work-life policies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(7), 1224-38.

Den Hartog, D. N., Boon, C., Verburg, R. M. & Croon, M. A. (2013). HRM, communication, satisfaction, and perceived performance: A cross-level test. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1637-65.

Eastman, K. K. (1994). In the eyes of the beholder: An attributional approach to ingratiation and organizational citizenship behaviour. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(5), 1379-91.

Ebner, N. C., Freund, A. M. & Baltes, P. B. (2006). Developmental changes in personal goal orientation from young to late adulthood: From striving for gains to maintenance and prevention of losses. *Psychology and Aging*, 21(4), 664-78.

Edgar, F. & Geare, A. (2005). HRM practice and employee attitudes: Different measures – different results. *Personnel Review*, 34(5), 534-49.

- Farndale, E., Hope-Hailey, V. & Kelliher, C. (2011). High commitment performance management: The roles of justice and trust. *Personnel Review*, 40(1), 5-23.
- Farndale, E. & Kelliher, C. (2013). Implementing performance appraisals: Exploring the employee experience. *Human Resource Management*, 52(6), 879-97.
- Farndale, E., Van Ruiten, J., Kelliher, C. & Hope-Hailey, V. (2011). The influence of perceived employee voice on organisational commitment: An exchange perspective. *Human Resource Management*, 50(1), 113-29.
- Fassina, N. E., Jones, D. A. & Uggerslev, K. L. (2008). Meta-analytic tests of relationships between organizational justice and citizenship behavior: Testing agent-system and shared variance models. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(6), 805-28.
- Feldman, D. C. & Doeringhaus, H. L. (1992). Patterns of part-time employment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 41(3), 283-94.
- Fischer, E. & Reuber, R. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unfamiliar: The challenges of reputation formation facing new firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(1), 53-75.
- Flint, D. H. (1999). The role of organisational justice in multi-source performance appraisal: Theory-based application and direction for research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(1), 1-20.
- Folger, R. (1986). Rethinking equity theory: A referent cognition model. In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen & J. Greenberg (eds), *Justice in Social Relations*. New York: Plenum, pp. 145-62.
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (eds), *Advances in Organizational Justice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp.1-55.

- Fridlund, A. J. (1992). The behavioral ecology and sociality of human faces. In M. S. Clark (ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 13. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp.90-121.
- Frijda, N. H., Mesquita, B., Sonnemans, J. & van Goozen, S. (1991). The duration of affective phenomena or emotions, sentiments, and passions. In K. T. Strongman (ed.), *International Review of Studies on Emotion*. Chichester: Wiley, pp.187-225.
- Fritz, C. & Sonnentag, S. (2009). Antecedents of day-level proactive behavior: A look at job stressors and positive affect during the workday. *Journal of Management*, 35(1), 94-111.
- Gajendran, R. S. & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524-41.
- Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A. & Delaney-Klinger, K. (2015). Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting's effects on performance via i-deals and job resources. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(2), 353-93.
- Gajendran, R. S. & Joshi, A. (2012). Innovation in globally distributed teams: The role of LMX, communication frequency, and member influence on team decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1252-61.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T. & Sakai, K. (2008). *National Study of Employers*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Gao, H., Darroch, J., Mather, D. & MacGregor, A. (2008). Signaling corporate strategy in IPO communication: A study of biotechnology IPOs on the NASDAQ. *Journal of Business Communication*, 45(1), 3-30.
- Garcia-Marques, T., Mackie, D. M., Claypool, H. M. & Garcia-Marques, L. (2004). Positivity can cue familiarity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(5), 585-93.

- Garrison, A. M. & Kahn, J. H. (2010). Intra-individual relations between the intensity and disclosure of daily emotional events: The moderating role of depressive symptoms. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(2), 187-97.
- Gelens, J., Dries, N., Hofmans, J. & Pepermans, R. (2013). The role of perceived organizational justice in shaping outcomes of talent management: A research study. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), 341-53.
- George, J. M. & Zhou, J. (2002). Understanding when bad moods foster creativity and good ones don't: The role of context and clarity of feelings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 687-97.
- George, J. M. & Zhou, J. (2007). Dual tuning in a supportive context: Joint contributions of positive mood, negative mood, and supervisory behaviors to employee creativity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 605-22.
- Gerhart, B. (2007). Horizontal and vertical fit in human resource systems. In C. Ostroff (ed.), *Perspectives on Organizational Fit*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp.317-418.
- Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y. & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 227-71.
- Glassner, V. & Keune, M. (2012). The crisis and social policy: The role of collective agreements. *International Labour Review*, 151(4), 351-75.
- Golden, L. (2008). Limited access: Disparities in flexible work schedules and work-at-home. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 29(1), 86-109.
- Golden, T. (2007). Co-workers who telework and the impact on those in the office: Understanding the implications of virtual work for co-worker satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, 60(11), 1641-67.
- Golden, T. D. (2011). Altering the effects of work and family conflict on exhaustion: Telework during traditional and nontraditional work hours. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 27(3), 255-69.

- Golden, T. D. & Veiga, J. F. (2005). The impact of extent of telecommuting on job satisfaction: Resolving inconsistent findings. *Journal of Management*, 31(2), 301-18.
- Golden, T. D., Veiga, J. F. & Simsek, Z. (2006). Telecommuting's differential impact on work-family conflict: Is there no place like home? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1340-50.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161-78.
- Greenberg, J. (2001). Setting the justice agenda: Seven unanswered questions about "what, why, and how". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 210-19.
- Greenberg, J., Roberge, M. E., Ho, V. T. & Rousseau, D. (2004). Fairness as an "i-deal": Justice in under-the-table employment arrangements. In J. J. Martocchio (ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*. Oxford: JAI Press/Elsevier Science, pp.1-34.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A. & Godshalk, V. M. (2010). *Career Management*, 4th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gubler, M., Arnold, J. & Coombs, C. (2014). Reassessing the protean career concept: Empirical findings, conceptual components, and measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S23-40.
- Guerrero, S. & Bentein, K. (2015). I-deals in damaged relationships. In P. M. Bal & D. M. Rousseau (eds), *Idiosyncratic Deals between Employees and Organizations: Conceptual Issues, Applications and the Role of Coworkers*. Oxford, UK: Taylor & Francis Group, pp.52-65.
- Guerrero, S., Bentein, K. & Lapalme, M.-E. (2014). Idiosyncratic deals and high performers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(2), 323-34.
- Guest, D. E. (2011). Human resource management and performance: Still searching for some answers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(1), 3-13.
- Guest, D. E. & Rodrigues, R. (2015). Career control. In H. De Vos & B. Van der Heijden (eds), *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Careers: Aims,*

Approach and Outline. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, pp.205-22.

Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in Organizations*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Hall, D. T. (2002). *Protean Careers In and Out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hansen, T. & Levine, J. M. (2009). Newcomers as change agents: Effects of newcomers' behavioral style and teams' performance optimism. *Social Influence*, 4(1), 46-61.

Hareli, S. & Hess, U. (2012). The social signal value of emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 26(3), 385-89.

Hareli, S., Shomrat, N. & Hess, U. (2009). Emotional versus neutral expressions and perceptions of social dominance and submissiveness. *Emotion*, 9(3), 378-84.

Hess, U., Adams, R. B., Jr & Kleck, R. E. (2005). Who may frown and who should smile? Dominance, affiliation, and the display of happiness and anger. *Cognition and Emotion*, 19(4), 515-36.

Hill, J., Grzywacz, J., Allen, S., Blanchard, V., Matz-Costa, C., Shulkin, S. & Pitt-Catsoupes, M. (2008). Defining and conceptualizing workplace flexibility. *Community, Work and Family*, 11(2), 149-63.

Ho, V. T. & Kong, D. T. (2015). Exploring the signaling function of idiosyncratic deals and their interaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 131(C), 149-61.

Ho, V. T., & Tekleab, A. G. (2016). A model of idiosyncratic deal-making and attitudinal outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(3), 642-56.

Hochschild, A. R. (1997). *Time Bind: When Work becomes Home and Home becomes Work*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.

Hoque, K. (1999). Human resource management and performance in the UK hotel industry. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 37(3), 419-43.

- Hoque, K. & Bacon, N. (2014). Unions, joint regulation and workplace equality policy and practice in Britain: Evidence from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(2), 265-84.
- Hoque, K. & Noon, M. (2004). Equal opportunities policy and practice in Britain: Evaluating the “empty shell” hypothesis, *Work, Employment and Society*, 18(3), 481-506.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M. & Glaser, J. (2008). Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 655-64.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M. & Glaser, J. (2009). Why supervisors make idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(8), 738-64.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., Glaser, J., Angerer, P. & Weigl, M. (2010). Beyond top-down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 187-215.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., Weigl, M., Muller, A. & Glaser, J. (2013). Redesigning work through idiosyncratic deals. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23(4), 1-18.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. & Gupta. V., eds (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hox, J. (2002). *Multilevel Analysis: Techniques and Applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hu, L.-T. & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55.
- Hu, J. & Liden, R. C. (2015). Making a difference in the teamwork: Linking team prosocial motivation to team processes and effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1102-27.

- Hülshager, U. R., Alberts, H. J. E. M., Feinholdt, A. & Langer, J. W. B. (2013). Benefits of mindfulness at work: The role of mindfulness in emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 310-25.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635-72.
- Ichniowski, C., Kochan, T. A., Levine, D., Olson, C. & Strauss, G. (1996). What works at work: Overview and assessment. *Industrial Relations*, 35(3), 299-333.
- Ichniowski, C., Shaw, K. & Prennushi, G. (1997). The effects of human resource management practices on productivity: A study of steel finishing lines. *The American Economic Review*, 87(3), 291-313.
- Ilies, R. & Judge, T.A. (2005). Goal regulation across time: The effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 453-67.
- Innocenti, L., Pilati, M. & Peluso, A. M. (2011). Trust as a moderator in the relationship between HRM practices and employee attitudes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(3), 303-17.
- Jackson, S. E. & Schuler, R. S. (1995). Understanding human resource management in the context of organizations and their environment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 46, 237-64.
- Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R. S. & Rivero, J. C. (1989). Organizational characteristics as predictors of personnel practices. *Personnel Psychology*, 42(4), 727-86.
- Janssen, J. Muller, P. & Greifeneder, R. (2011). Cognitive processes in procedural justice judgments: The role of ease- of- retrieval, uncertainty, and experience. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 726-50.
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Han, K., Hong, Y., Kim, A. & Winkler, A.-L. (2012). Clarifying the construct of human resource systems: Relating human resource management to employee performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(2), 73-85.

- Jiang, K., Lepak, D., Hu, J. & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264-94.
- Jiang, K., Takeuchi, R. & Lepak, D. P. (2013). Where do we go from here? New perspectives on the black box in strategic human resource management research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(8), 1448-80.
- Johnson, R.E., Lanaj, K. & Barnes, C.M. (2014). The good and bad of being fair: Effects of procedural and interpersonal justice behaviors on regulatory resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(4), 635-50.
- Jokisaari, M. & Nurmi, J. (2009). Change in newcomers' supervisor support and socialization outcomes after organizational entry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3), 527-44.
- Kalmi, P. & Kauhanen, A. (2008). Workplace innovations and employee outcomes: Evidence from Finland. *Industrial Relations*, 47(3), 430-59.
- Kaufman, B. E. & Miller, B. I. (2011). The firm's choice of HRM practices: Economics meets strategic human resource management. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 64(3), 526-57.
- Kehoe, R. R. & Wright, P. M. (2013). The impact of high performance HR practices on employees' attitudes and behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), 366-91.
- Kelley, H. H. & Michela, J. L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31, 457-501.
- Kelly, E. L. & Moen, P. (2007). Rethinking the clockwork of work: Why schedule control may pay off at work and at home. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 487-506.
- Keltner, D. T. & Haidt, J. (2001). Social functions of emotions. In T. Mayne & G. A. Bonanno (eds), *Emotions: Current Issues and Future Directions*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Keltner, D. T. & Lerner, J. S. (2010). Emotion. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (eds), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. New York: Wiley, 317-52.
- Khilji, S. & Wang, X. (2006). "Intended" and "implemented" HRM: The missing linchpin in strategic human resource management research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(7), 1171-89.
- Kiefer, T. & Barclay, L. (2012). Understanding the mediating role of toxic emotional experiences in the relationship between negative emotions and adverse outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(4), 600-25.
- Kim, T.-Y. & Leung, K. (2007). Forming and reacting to overall fairness: A cross-cultural comparison. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 104(1), 83-95.
- Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Purcell, J., Rayton, B. & Swart, J. (2005). Satisfaction with HR practices and commitment: Why one size does not fit all. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15(4), 9-29.
- Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B. & Gibson, C. B. (2006). A quarter century of culture's consequences: A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(3), 285-320.
- Klein, K. J., Bliese, P. D., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Dansereau, F., Gavin, M. B., Griffin, M. A., Hofmann, D. A., James, L. R., Yammarino, F. J. & Bligh, M. C. (2000). *Multilevel Analytical Techniques: Commonalities, Differences, and Continuing Questions*. New York: Jossey Bass.
- Klein, K. J., Bliese, P. D., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Dansereau, F., Gavin, M. B., Griffin, M. A., Kleysen, R. F. & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(3), 248-296.
- Kleysen, R. F. & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(3), 248-96.

- Kluemper, D. H., Little, L. M. & Degroot, T. (2009). State or trait: Effects of state optimism on job-related outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), 209-31.
- Kooij, D., De Lange, A., Jansen, P. & Dijkers, J. (2008). Older workers' motivation to continue to work: Five meanings of age. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(6), 364-94.
- Kopelman, D., Rosette, A. & Thompson, L. (2006). The three faces of Eve: Strategic displays of positive, negative, and neutral emotions in negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 99(1), 81-101.
- Korff, J., Biemann, T. & Voelpel, S. C. (2016). Differentiating HR systems' impact: Moderating effects of age on the HR system–work outcome association. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, doi: 10.1002/job.2130.
- Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Thompson, R. J. & Burke, L. B. (2014). *Leveraging Workplace Flexibility: Fostering Engagement and Productivity*. Alexandria, VA: SHRM Foundation. Available from: <https://www.shrm.org/about/foundation/products/Documents/9-14%20Work-Flex%20EPG-FINAL.pdf>.
- Kossek, E. & Lee, M. (2008). Implementing a reduced-workload arrangement to retain high talent: A case study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 11(1), 49-64.
- Kossek, E. & Michel, J. (2016). Flexible work schedules. In S. Zedeck (ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 1. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp.535-72.
- Kossek, E. E., Olier-Malaterre, A., Lee, M. D., Pichler, S. & Hall, D. T. (2016). Line managers' rationales for professionals' reduced-load work in embracing and ambivalent organizations. *Human Resource Management*, 55(1), 143-71.
- Kossek, E. & Thompson, R. (2015). Workplace flexibility: Integrating employer and employee perspectives to close the research-practice implementation

- gap. In L. Eby & T. Allen (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*. New York: Oxford University Press, Ch. 19.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L. & Stevens, C. K. (2001). Goal congruence in project teams: Does the fit between members' personal mastery and performance goals matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1083-95.
- Kroon, B., Freese, C. & Schalk, R. (2015). A strategic HRM perspective on i-deals. In M. Bal & D. M. Rousseau (eds), *Idiosyncratic Deals between Employees and Organizations: Conceptual Issues, Applications, and the Role of Coworkers*. Hove: Psychology Press, pp.73-91.
- Kuvaas, B. (2008). An exploration of how the employee-organization relationship affects the linkage between perception of developmental human resource practices and employee outcomes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(1), 1-25.
- Lai, L., Rousseau, D. M. & Chang, T. T. (2009). Idiosyncratic deals: Coworkers as interested third parties. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 547-56.
- Lapierre, L. M. & Allen, T. D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: Implications for work-family conflict and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(2), 169-81.
- Laurence, G. A. (2010). Workaholism and expansion and contraction oriented job crafting: The moderating effects of individual and contextual factors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Graduate School, Syracuse University, New York.
- Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E. & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 841-66.
- Lawler, E. E. & Finegold, D. (2000). Individualizing the organization: Past, present and future. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(1), 1-15.

- Lee, T. W. & Johnson, D. R. (1991). The effects of work schedule and employment status on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of full- versus part-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 38(2), 208-24.
- Lepak, D. P., Liao, H., Chung, Y. & Harden, E. E. (2006). A conceptual review of human resource management systems in strategic human resource management research. In J. J. Martocchio (ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp.217-71.
- Lepak, D. P. & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 31-48.
- Lepak, D. P. & Snell, S. A. (2002). Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. *Journal of Management*, 28(4), 517-43.
- Lepak, D. P., Takeuchi, R. & Swart, J. (2011). How organizations evaluate and maintain fit of human capital with their needs. In A. Burton-Jones & J.-C. Spender (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Human Capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Ch.12.
- Leslie, L. M., Manchester, C. F., Park, T.-Y. & Mehng, S. A. (2012). Flexible work practices: A source of career premiums or penalties? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1407-28.
- Liao, H. & Chuang, A. (2004). A multilevel investigation of factors influencing employee service performance and customer outcomes. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 47(1), 41-58.
- Liao, C., Wayne, S. & Rousseau, D. M. (2016). Idiosyncratic deals in contemporary organizations: A qualitative and meta-analytical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(S1), S9-29.
- Liden, R. C. & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multi-dimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24(1), 43-72.

- Lindell, M. K. & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 114–21.
- Little, L. M., Gooty, J. & Williams, M. (2016). The role of leader emotion management in leader-member exchange and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 85-97.
- Liu, J., Lee, C., Hui, C., Kwan, H. K. & Wu, L. Z. (2013). Idiosyncratic deals and employee outcomes: The mediating roles of social exchange and self-enhancement and the moderating role of individualism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(5), 832-40.
- MacDuffie, J. P. (1995). Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance: Organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 48(2), 197-221.
- MacKinnon, D. P. (2008). *Introduction to Statistical Mediation Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- MacKinnon, D. P. & Fairchild, A. J. (2009). Current directions in mediation analyses. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(1), 16-20.
- Maitlis, S. (2005). The social processes of organizational sense-making. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1), 21-49.
- Maitlis, S. & Ozcelik, H. (2004). Toxic decision processes: A study of emotion and organizational decision making. *Organization Science*, 15(4), 375-93.
- Marescaux, E., De Winne, S. & Sels, L. (2013). HR practices and affective organizational commitment: (When) does HR differentiation pay off? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(4), 329-45.
- Marescaux E., De Winne S., Sels L., (2015). Co-worker reactions to i-deals: A distributive justice perspective. Annual Academy of Management Meeting, Buena Vista, USA.
- Martin, R., Guillaume, Y., Thomas, G., Lee, A. & Epitropaki, O. (2015). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 69(1), 67-121.

- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T. & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410-76.
- McDermott, A. M., Conway, E., Rousseau, D. M. & Flood, P. C. (2013). Promoting effective psychological contracts through leadership: The missing link between HR strategy and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 52(2), 289-310.
- McGinnis, S. K. & Morrow, P. C. (1990). Job attitudes among full- and part-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 36(1), 82-96.
- McGloskey, D. W. & Igbaria, M. (2003). Does “out of sight” mean “out of mind”? An empirical investigation of the career advancement prospects of telecommuters. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 16(2), 19-34.
- Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H. & Axelrod, B. (2001). *The War for Talent*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Mislin, A. A., Campagna, R. L. & Bottom, W. P. (2011). After the deal: Talk, trust building and the implementation of negotiated agreements. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115(1), 55-68.
- Moors, A., Ellsworth, P. C., Scherer, K. R. & Frijda, N. H. (2013). Appraisal theories of emotion: State of the art and future development. *Emotion Review*, 5(2), 119-24.
- Morton, L. (2005). *Talent Management Value Imperatives: Strategies for Execution*. New York: The Conference Board.
- Nezlek, J. B. (2001). Multilevel random coefficient analyses of event- and interval-contingent data in social and personality psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(7), 771-85.
- Ng, T. W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2008). Can you get a better deal elsewhere? The effects of psychological contract replicability on organizational commitment over time. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(2), 268-77.
- Ng., T. W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Idiosyncratic deals and employee commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 419-27.

- Ng, T. W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2012). Idiosyncratic deals and voice behaviour. *Journal of Management*, 41(3), 893-928.
- Ng, T. W. H., Feldman, D. C. & Lam, S. S. K. (2010). Psychological contract breaches, organizational commitment, and innovation-related behaviour: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 744-51.
- Ng, T. W. H. & Lucianetti, L. (2016). Goal striving, idiosyncratic deals and job behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(1), 41-60.
- Nicklin, J. M., Greenbaum, R., McNall, L. A., Folger, R. & Williams, K. J. (2011). The importance of judging contextual variables when judging fairness: An examination of counterfactual thoughts and fairness theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 114(2), 127-41.
- Nicklin, J. M. & Williams, K. J. (2009). Reactions to others' mistakes: An empirical test of fairness theory. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(5), 533-58.
- Nielsen, T. R., Carlson, D. S. & Lankau, M. J. (2001). The supportive mentor as a means of reducing work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 364-81.
- Nishii, L. H., Lepak, D. P. & Schneider, B. (2008). Employee attributions of the "why" of HR practices: Their effects on employee attitudes and behaviors, and customer satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(3), 503-45.
- Nishii, L. H. & Wright, P. M. (2008). Variability within organizations: Implications for strategic human resource management. In D. B. Smith (ed.), *The People Make the Place: Dynamic Linkages between Individuals and Organizations*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 225-248.
- Ogbonnaya, C., Daniels, K., Connolly, S. & van Veldhoven, M. (2016). Integrated and isolated impact of high-performance work practices on employee health and well-being: A comparative study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, doi: 10.1037/ocp0000027.
- Olekalns, M. & Druckman, D. (2014). With feeling: How emotions shape negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, 30(4), 455-78.

- Olmsted, B. & Smith, S. (1989). *Creating a Flexible Workplace: How to Select and Manage Alternative Work Options*. New York: AMACOM.
- Osterman, P. (1994). How common is workplace transformation and who adopts it? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47(2), 173-88.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M. & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 3-72.
- Paauwe, J. (2009). HRM and performance: Achievements, methodological issues and prospects. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(1), 129-42.
- Perry-Smith, J. E. & Blum, T. C. (2000). Work-family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1107-17.
- Pil, F. & MacDuffie, J. P. (1996). The adoption of high-involvement work practices. *Industrial Relations*, 35(3), 423-55.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social sciences research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 539-69.
- Powell, G. N. & Mainiero, L. A. (1999). Managerial decision making regarding alternative work arrangements. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(1), 41-56.
- Preacher, K. J. (2015). Advances in mediation analysis: A survey and synthesis of new developments. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 825-52.
- Preacher, K. J., Curran, P. J. & Bauer, D. J. (2006). Computational tools for probing interaction effects in multiple linear regression, multilevel modeling, and latent curve analysis. *Journal of Educational & Behavioral Statistics*, 31(4), 437-48.
- Preacher, K. S. & Sig, J. P. (2012). Advantages of Monte Carlo confidence intervals for indirect effects. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 6(2), 77-98.

- Preacher, K. J., Zyphur, M. J. & Zhang, Z. (2010). A general multilevel SEM framework for assessing multilevel mediation. *Psychological Methods*, 15(3), 209-33.
- Prieto, A. (1992). A method for translation of instruments to other languages. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 43(1), 1-14.
- Purcell, J. (1999). The search for best practice and best fit in human resource management: Chimera or cul de sac? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9(3), 26-41.
- Purcell, J. & Hutchinson, S. (2007). Front-line managers as agents in the HRM-performance causal chain: Theory, analysis and evidence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17(1), 3-20.
- Rasbash, J., Browne, W., Healy, M., Cameron, B. & Charlton, C. (2000). *MlwiN (Version 2.1): Interactive Software for Multilevel Analysis*. London: Multilevel Models Project, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Raudenbush, S. W. & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Reif, J. A. M. & Brodbeck, F. C. (2014). Initiation of negotiation and its role in negotiation research: Foundations of a theoretical model. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 4(4), 363-81.
- Rigney, D. (2010). *The Matthew Effect: How Advantage Begets Further Advantage*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rioux, S. M. & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1306-14.
- Rofcanin, Y., Berber, A., Koch, S. & Sevinc, L. (2015). Job crafting and i-deals: A study testing the nomological network of proactive behaviours. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, doi: org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1091370.
- Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2014). Are we missing a link? The mediation of positive affective states between i-deals and employee outcomes. Paper

presented at the 2014 Academy of Management Conference, Philadelphia, USA.

- Rosen, C., Chang, C., Johnson, R. & Levy, P. (2009). Perceptions of the organizational context and psychological contract breach: Assessing competing perspectives. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 108(2), 202-17.
- Rosen, C. C., Slater, D. J., Chang, D. and Johnson, R. E. (2013). Let's make a deal: Development and validation of the ex post i-deals scale. *Journal of Management*, 39(3), 709-42.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2005). *I-Deals: Idiosyncratic Deals Employees Bargain for Themselves*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Rousseau, D. M., Ho, V. T. & Greenberg, J. (2006). I-deals: Idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4), 977-94.
- Rousseau, D. M., Hornung, S. & Kim, T. G. (2009). Idiosyncratic deals: Testing propositions on timing, content, and the employment relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(3), 338-48.
- Rousseau, D. M. & Kim, T. G. (2006). When workers bargain for themselves: Idiosyncratic deals and the nature of the employment relationship. Paper presented at the British Academy of Management Conference, Belfast, Ireland, 12-14 September.
- Said, C. P., Sebe, N. & Todorov, A. (2009). Structural resemblance to emotional expressions predicts evaluation of emotionally neutral faces. *Emotion*, 9(2), 260-64.
- Salancik, G. R. & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitude and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(2), 224-53.

- Salas, E. & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471-99.
- Selig, J. P. & Preacher, K. J. (2008). Monte Carlo method for assessing mediation: An interactive tool for creating confidence intervals for indirect effects [Computer software]. Available from: <http://quantpsy.org/>.
- Seong, J. Y. & Choi, J. N. (2014). Effects of group-level fit on group conflict and performance: The initiating role of leader positive affect. *Group & Organization Management*, 39(2), 190-212.
- Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The death of justice theory is likely if theorists neglect the “wheels” already invented and the voices of the injustice victims. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 235-42.
- Shockley, K. M. & Allen, T. D. (2007). When flexibility helps: Another look at the availability of flexible work arrangements and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71(3), 479-93.
- SHRM (2015). *2015 Strategic Benefits Survey: Leveraging Benefits to Recruit Employees*. Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management.
- Singer, J. and Willett, J. (2003). *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, C. A. & Kirby, L. D. (2001). Towards delivering on the promise of appraisal theory. In K. Scherer, A. Schorr & T. Johnstone (eds), *Appraisal Processes in Emotion: Theory, Methods, Research*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp.121-38.
- Snape, E. & Redman, T. (2010). HRM practices, organizational citizenship behaviour, and performance: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(7), 1219-47.
- Snell, S. A. & Dean, J. W. (1992). Integrated manufacturing and human resource management: A human capital perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 467-504.

- Song, L. J., Tsui, A. S. & Law, K. S. (2008). Unpacking employee responses to organizational exchange mechanisms: The role of social and economic exchange perceptions. *Journal of Management*, 35(1), 56-93.
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355-74.
- Spence, M. (2002). Signaling in retrospect and the informational structure of markets. *American Economic Review*, 92(3), 434-59.
- Stanton, P., Young, S., Bartram, T. & Leggat, S. (2010). Singing the same song: Translating HR messages across management hierarchies in Australian hospitals. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(4), 567-81.
- Stavrou, E. T. (2005). Flexible work bundles and organizational competitiveness: A cross-national study of the European work context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(8), 923-47.
- Staw, B. M., Sutton, R. I. & Pelled, S. H. (1994). Employee positive emotions and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 51-71.
- Stewart, A. E. (2005). Attributions of responsibility for motor vehicle crashes. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 37(4), 681-88.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Information and the change in the paradigm in economics. *American Economic Review*, 92(3), 460-501.
- Takeuchi, R., Chen, G. & Lepak, D. P. (2009). Through the looking glass of a social system: Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems on employees' attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 1-29.
- Taskin, L. & Devos, V. (2005). Paradoxes from the individualization of human resource management: The case of telework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62(1), 13-24.
- Ten Brummelhuis, L. L. & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work-home interface: The work-home resources model. *American Psychologist*, 67(7), 545-56.

- Terpstra, D. E. & Rozell, E. J. (1993). The relationship of staffing practices to organizational-level measures of performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(1), 27-48.
- Thibaut, J. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thompson, L. F. & Aspinwall, K. R. (2009). The recruitment value of work/life benefits. *Personnel Review*, 38(2), 195-210.
- Thompson, R. J., Payne, S. C. & Taylor, A. B. (2015). Applicant attraction to flexible work arrangements: Separating the influence of flextime and flexplace. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(4), 726-49.
- Thompson, L. L., Wang, J. & Gunia, B. C. (2010). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 491-515.
- Tiedens, L. Z. & Linton, S. (2001). Judgment under emotional certainty and uncertainty: The effects of specific emotions on information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(6), 973-88.
- Toh, S. M., Morgeson, F. P. & Campion, M. A. (2008). Human resource configurations: Investigating fit with the organizational context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(4), 864-82.
- Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security (2015). Statistics, available at: <http://www.csgeb.gov.tr/En>.
- Van De Voorde, K. & Beijer, S. (2015). The role of employee HR attributions in the relationship between high-performance work systems and employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(1), 62-78.
- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the job-related affective well-being scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 219-30.
- Van Kleef, G. A. (2010). The emerging view of emotion as social information. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(5), 331-43.

- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W. & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004a). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(1), 57-76.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W. & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004b). The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(4), 510-28.
- Van Rijswijk, K., Bekker, M. H. J., Rutte, C. G. & Croon, M. A. (2004). The relationships among part-time work, work-family interference, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(4), 286-95.
- Van Wanrooy, B., Bewley, H., Bryson, A., Freeth, S., Forth, J., Stokes, L. & Wood, S. (2013). *Employment Relations in the Shadow of Recession: Findings from the 2011 Workplace Employment Relations Study*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Vidarthi, P. R., Chaudhry, A., Anand, S. & Liden, R. C. (2014). Flexibility i-deals: How much is ideal? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(3), 246-65.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E. & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 247-52.
- Watson, I., Buchanan, J., Campbell, I. & Briggs, C. (2003). *Fragmented Futures: New Challenges in Working Life*. Sydney, Australia: Federation Press.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548-73.
- Wood, S. J. (1999). Human resource management and performance. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 1(4), 367-413.
- World at Work, (2013). *Survey on Workplace Flexibility*. Available from: <https://www.worldatwork.org/adimLink?id=7389>.
- Wright, P. M., Gardner, T. M. & Moynihan, L. M. (2003). The impact of HR practices on the performance of business units. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(3), 21-36.

- Wright, P. M. & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 295-320.
- Wright, P. M. & McMahan, G. C. (2011). Exploring human capital: Putting human back into strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(2), 93-104.
- Wrzesniewski, A. & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179-201.
- Youndt, M. A. & Snell, S. A. (2004). Human resource configurations, intellectual capital, and organizational performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(3), 337-60.
- Yu, K. Y. T. (2009). Affective influences in person-environment fit theory: Exploring the role of affect as both cause and outcome of P-E fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1210-26.

Publications and Presentations Arising out of this Thesis

Journal Papers

Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. What seals the I-deal? Exploring the role of employees' behaviours and managers' emotional responses. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (revise and resubmit).

Conference Presentations

Rofcanin, Y., Hoque, K., & Kiefer, T. (2016). The downside of HR differentiation. Exploring the effects of employee non-entitlement to flexitime. Paper (to be) presented at the Second CIPD Conference for Applied Research, University of Westminster, London, UK.

Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2015). What seals the I-deal? The interplay of employees' motives and managers' emotions. Paper presented at the First CIPD Conference for Applied Research, The Shard, London, UK.

Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2015). Sealing the deal: The role of employee motives and manager emotions in the I-deals process. Paper presented at the *Scrutinizing I-deals and its Impact beyond the Focal Employee* Symposium during the 75th Academy of Management Annual Conference, Vancouver, Canada.

Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2015). The justice of I-deals. Paper presented at the 17th EAWOP Conference, Oslo, Norway.

Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2014). The role of emotions in the I-deals process. Paper presented at EAWOP Small Group Meeting on Idiosyncratic Deals, University of Bath, Bath, UK.

Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T. & Strauss, K. (2014). The mediation of positive affective states between I-deals and employee outcomes: Are we missing a link? Paper presented at the 74th Academy of Management Annual Conference, Philadelphia, USA.

Rofcanin, Y. and Kiefer, T. (2013). Motives and I-deals: An exploratory study. Paper presented at the 4th Institute of Work Psychology Conference, Sheffield, UK.

Rofcanin, Y. and Kiefer, T. (2013). When are I-deals ideal? Placing the effects of self-serving, other-serving and image-serving motivations between proactive I-deals and supervisor rated outcomes. Paper presented at the 27th British Academy of Management Conference, Liverpool, UK.

**Appendix 1: Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Employee-
and Workplace-Level Control Variables**

Employee-Level Variable	Mean	SD
Gender	1.55	0.63
Age	5.75	1.51
Dependent Children	1.19	2.14
Workplace Tenure	3.43	1.66
Managerial Status	2.67	0.60
Full- versus Part-Time Status	1.05	0.89
Membership of Trade Union or Association	2.07	1.11
Degree	0.30	0.12
Ethnicity	1.42	3.18
Fixed/Base Wage	0.61	1.80
Workplace-Level Variable		
Workplace Size	466. 59	1,182.9
Organization Size	6.20	6.37
Single or Otherwise	1.27	0.48
National Ownership	0.69	1.94
Union Recognition	0.81	0.63
Formal Status of the Organization	5.67	4.48
Number of Years Workplace in Operation	41.74	53.53
Socio-Economic Group	65.76	25.56
Total Number of Employees in Managerial and Senior Official Groups	33.85	104.63
Non-UK National Employees	1.61	0.66
SOC 2007	12.22	5.06

Notes: N = 19,453 employees, 1,545 workplaces.

Appendix 2: Time 1 Survey for Study 1 and Study 2

Welcome to Survey of I-Deals (Idiosyncratic deals) designed and carried out by Yasin Rofcanin and by his supervisor, Professor Tina Kiefer, at Warwick Business School. This survey is part of Yasin`s Ph.D. study at Warwick Business School.

In today`s work settings where uncertainty, ambiguity and unpredictability prevail; employees take steps to affect, shape and expand what happen in their daily works. We call those Idiosyncratic Deals or I-Deals. This survey is designed to understand I-Deals that are voluntary, personalized and mutually-beneficial agreements between subordinates and supervisors. Please participate and help us understand this construct and its consequences in the context of Turkey. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, your anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained at all times. There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research. There are no right or wrong answers. It is important that you answer the questions candidly. You may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence or explanation. If you decide to withdraw your data (by not clicking on the “Submit” button at the end of the survey), your responses will be discarded. Alternatively, you can click “opt out” at the bottom of the email. Only for research purposes, we will ask some of the questions to your direct supervisors. But they will have no access to your answers on this survey. Similarly, you will

have no access to their answers. Access to data is only limited to the researcher who will use them for study purposes.

Please feel free to contact with Yasin Rofcanin at: yasin.rofcanin@mail.wbs.ac.uk
Thanks for your participation

Kind regards

Yasin Rofcanin

Dr. Tina Kiefer

Dr. Karoline Strauss

University of Warwick, Warwick Business School.

Which management level do you belong to?

- ☐ Non-management (1)
- ☐ Line management/supervisor (2)
- ☐ Middle management (3)
- ☐ Senior management (4)

I- deals are voluntary, personalized agreements of a nonstandard nature negotiated between individual employees and their employers regarding terms that benefit each party.

To what extent you asked for and successfully negotiated the below aspects in your recent work and within the last six month? Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Extra responsibilities that take advantage of the skills that I bring to the job. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tasks that better develop my skills. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tasks that better fit my personality, skills, and abilities. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities to take on desired responsibilities outside of my formal job requirements. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More flexibility in how I complete my job. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A desirable position that makes use of my unique abilities. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A work schedule that meets my personalized needs. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Off-the-job demands when assigning my work hours. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Time off to attend to non-work-related issues. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A unique arrangement with my supervisor that allows me to complete a portion of my work outside of the office. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Working from somewhere other than the main office. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compensation arrangement that meets my needs. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A compensation arrangement that is tailored to fit me. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A personalized compensation. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A raise in my pay because of the exceptional contributions that I make to the organization. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A compensation plan that rewards my unique contributions. (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

The questions you just answered aim at understanding your I-Deals. Such I-deals are voluntary, personalized and non-written agreements.

The following questions will be related to your recent I-deal efforts at your work places.

What motivates you to work?

I am motivated to do my work

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Because I enjoy the work itself. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because it's fun. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I find the work engaging. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I enjoy it. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I want to have positive impact on others. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I want to help others through my work. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Because I care about benefiting others through my work. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because it is important to me to do good for others through my work. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Concerning your work behaviors, how reflective are below statements of you? I am motivated to work, because :

	Very untrue of me (1)	Untrue of me (2)	Neutral (3)	True of me (4)	True of me (5)
I want to avoid looking bad in front of others. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I want to avoid looking lazy. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To look better than my co-workers. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To avoid a reprimand from my boss. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I fear appearing irresponsible. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To look like I am busy. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To stay out of trouble. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because rewards are important to me. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Because I want a raise. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To impress my co- workers. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

As previously noted, an idiosyncratic deal is a voluntary, personalized agreement negotiated between an employee and his or her supervisor. Concerning your most

recent I-deal efforts, how frequently did you also feel the below when engaging in this /these behavior(s)?

In the process of my most recent I-deal negotiation:

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	All of the Time (5)
My negative emotional experiences were ongoing. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I experienced prolonged negative emotions. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My negative emotions kept re-surfacing. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Different situations kept bringing back my negative emotions. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Some negative emotional experiences just did not go away. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I withdrew from others. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I isolated myself . (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I felt alone. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I lost interest in interacting with others. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Others ignored me. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt exhausted. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My energy level decreased. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt disconnected from my work. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt drained. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt lethargic. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Concerning your most recent I-deal efforts, how frequently did you also feel the below when engaging in this/these behavior(s)?

In the process of my most recent I-deal negotiation:

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	All of the Time (5)
I had ongoing positive emotional experiences. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I experienced prolonged positive emotions. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My positive emotions kept re-surfacing. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Different situations kept bringing back my positive emotions. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I connected with others. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I socialized with others. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt included. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I was interested in interacting with others. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Others noticed me in a positive way. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt energized. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My energy level increased. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt re-connected to my work. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt energetic. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt stimulated. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Concerning your most recent I-deal efforts, how frequently did you experience the emotions listed below when engaging in this/these behavior(s)

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Always (5)
Angry. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Frustrated. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disappointed. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Embarrassed. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Anxious. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guilty. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ignored. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discouraged. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hurt. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enthusiastic. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pleased. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Optimistic. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Grateful. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compassionate. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Happy. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proud. (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do what my job requires; this organization does not have the right to expect more. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I don't mind spending a half-hour past quitting time if I can finish a task. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The most important things that happen to me involve my work. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I live, eat and breath my job. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Most things in my life are more important than my work. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
All in all, I am satisfied with my job. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, I like my job. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, I like working here. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your current job?

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I often think about quitting. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I will probably look for a new job in the next year. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you believe that below statements reflect you

	Very Untrue (1)	Untrue (2)	Neutral (3)	True (4)	Very True (5)
I am willing to give my time to help others who have work related problems. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even when working under high pressure. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I assist others with their duties. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you believe that below statements reflect you

	Very Untrue (1)	Untrue (2)	Neutral (3)	True (4)	Very True (5)
I express loyalty toward the organization. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I keep up with developments in the organization. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I show pride when representing the organization in public. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I take action to protect the organization from potential problems. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you agree with below statements

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I like my supervisor very much as a person. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor is a lot of fun to work with. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

My supervisor would come to my defense if I were "attacked" by others. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do work for my supervisor that goes beyond what is specified in my job description. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I am willing to apply extra efforts beyond those normally required in order to meet his/her work goals. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am impressed with my supervisor's knowledge of his/her job. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I respect my supervisor's knowledge of and competence on the job. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I admire my supervisor's professional skills. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not mind working the hardest for him/her. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

You should rate how much the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Extraverted, enthusiastic. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reserved, quiet. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Anxious, easily upset. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Calm, emotionally stable. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The dummy-coding for the below demographic questions are shown below.

The following questions are intended to obtain an overall picture about your demographic profile.

☐ Age (1) _____

Coded as a continuous variable.

Gender

- ☐ Male (1)
- ☐ Female (2)

Coded as 1 = male; 2 = female.

How long have you worked for your current firm?

☐ Number of years at current firm (1) _____

Coded as a continuous variable.

How long have you held your current position?

☐ Number of years at current position (1) _____

Coded as a continuous variable.

What is the highest level of education you have achieved?

- ☐ High School (1)
- ☐ Vocational School (2)
- ☐ University (3)
- ☐ Graduate School (4)
- ☐ Other (5)

Coded as following:

1 = High school

2 = Vocational school

3 = University

4 = Graduate school

5 = Other

In your job, how often does this employee engage in the following behaviors?
(Evaluated by focal employee's managers)

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Quite Often (4)	Very Often (5)
Make suggestions and produces ideas to improve current products, services, processes or practices. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acquire new knowledge and actively contribute to the development of new products, services, processes or practices. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Create new ideas for difficult issues. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Search out new working methods, techniques, or instruments. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Generate original solutions for problems. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mobilize support for innovative ideas. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acquire approval for innovative ideas. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Make important organizational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transform innovative ideas into useful applications. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Introducing innovative ideas into the work environment in a systematic way. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluating the utility of innovative ideas. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you agree with below statements concerning this focal employee? (Evaluated by focal employee's managers)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
In general, this focal employees' performance is better than the work performance of most of co-workers. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This focal employees' performance is consistently of high quality. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The quality of this focal employees' performance fluctuates. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sometimes this focal employees' performance at work is not as good as it should be. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Compared to others in similar positions, this focal employees' performance is far above average. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Often this focal employees' performance level exceeds the expected standards of my job. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please think back to the most recent successful I-deal negotiation this employee had with you. How frequently did you feel the below during this process? (Evaluated by focal employees' managers for each focal employee)

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Always (5)
Happy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Optimistic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Joyful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Satisfied					
Relieved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Angry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Betrayed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disappointed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guilty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unhappy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following questions are intended to obtain an overall picture about your demographic profile.

☐ Age (1) _____

Coded as a continuous variable.

Gender

- ☐ Male (1)
- ☐ Female (2)

Coded as 1 = Male; 2 = Female.

How long have you worked for your current firm?

☐ Number of years at current firm (1) _____

Coded as a continuous variable.

How long have you held your current position?

☐ Number of years at current position (1) _____

Coded as a continuous variable.

What is the highest level of education you have achieved?

- ☐ High School (1)
- ☐ Vocational School (2)
- ☐ University (3)
- ☐ Graduate School (4)
- ☐ Other (5)

Coded as following:

1 = High school

2 = Vocational school

3 = University

4 = Graduate School

5 = Other

Appendix 3: Time 2 Survey for Study 1 and Study 2

Thank you for participating in Survey 1 that was carried out six months ago. Welcome to the second survey on idiosyncratic deals, designed and carried out by Yasin Rofcanin and by his supervisors, Professor Tina Kiefer and Associate Professor Karoline Strauss at Warwick Business School. This survey is part of Yasin`s Ph.D. study at Warwick Business School.

In today`s work settings where uncertainty, ambiguity and unpredictability prevail; employees take steps to affect, shape and expand what happen in their daily works. We call those Idiosyncratic Deals or I-Deals. This survey is designed to understand I-Deals that are voluntary, personalized and mutually-beneficial agreements between subordinates and supervisors. Please participate and help us understand this construct and its consequences in the context of Turkey. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, your anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained at all times. There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research. There are no right or wrong answers. It is important that you answer the questions candidly. You may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence or explanation. If you decide to withdraw your data (by not clicking on the “Submit” button at the end of the survey), your responses will be discarded. Alternatively, you can click “opt out” at the bottom of the email. Only for research purposes, we will ask some of the questions to your direct supervisors. But they will have no access to your answers on this survey. Similarly, you will

have no access to their answers. Access to data is only limited to the researcher who will use them for study purposes.

Please feel free to contact with Yasin Rofcanin at: yasin.rofcanin@mail.wbs.ac.uk
Thanks for your participation

Kind regards

Yasin Rofcanin

Dr. Tina Kiefer

Dr. Karoline Strauss University of Warwick, Warwick Business School.

I- deals are voluntary, personalized agreements of a nonstandard nature negotiated between individual employees and their employers regarding terms that benefit each party.

To what extent you have obtained the below aspects that you negotiated for six months ago? Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Extra responsibilities that take advantage of the skills that I bring to the job. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tasks that better develop my skills. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tasks that better fit my personality, skills, and abilities. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities to take on desired responsibilities outside of my formal job requirements. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More flexibility in how I complete my job. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A desirable position that makes use of my unique abilities. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A work schedule that meets my personalized needs. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Off-the-job demands when assigning my work hours. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Time off to attend to non-work-related issues. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A unique arrangement with my supervisor that allows me to complete a portion of my work outside of the office. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Working from somewhere other than the main office. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compensation arrangement that meets my needs. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A compensation arrangement that is tailored to fit me. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A personalized compensation. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A raise in my pay because of the exceptional contributions that I make to the organization. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A compensation plan that rewards my unique contributions. (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

The questions you just answered aim at understanding your I-Deals. Such I-deals are voluntary, personalized and non-written agreements.

The following questions will be related to your recent I-deal efforts at your work places.

What motivates you to work?

I am motivated to do my work

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Because I enjoy the work itself. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because it's fun. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I find the work engaging. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I enjoy it. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I want to have positive impact on others. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I want to help others through my work. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Because I care about benefiting others through my work. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because it is important to me to do good for others through my work. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Concerning your work behaviors, how reflective are below statements of you? I am motivated to work, because :

	Very untrue of me (1)	Untrue of me (2)	Neutral (3)	True of me (4)	True of me (5)
I want to avoid looking bad in front of others. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I want to avoid looking lazy. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To look better than my co-workers. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To avoid a reprimand from my boss. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I fear appearing irresponsible. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To look like I am busy. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To stay out of trouble. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because rewards are important to me. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Because I want a raise. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To impress my co- workers. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

As previously noted, an idiosyncratic deal is a voluntary, personalized agreement negotiated between an employee and his or her supervisor. Concerning your most

recent I-deal efforts, how frequently did you also feel the below when engaging in this /these behavior(s)?

In the process of my most recent I-deal negotiation:

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	All of the Time (5)
My negative emotional experiences were ongoing. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I experienced prolonged negative emotions. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My negative emotions kept re-surfacing. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Different situations kept bringing back my negative emotions. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Some negative emotional experiences just did not go away. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I withdrew from others. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I isolated myself . (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I felt alone. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I lost interest in interacting with others. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Others ignored me. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt exhausted. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My energy level decreased. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt disconnected from my work. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt drained. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt lethargic. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Concerning your most recent I-deal efforts, how frequently did you also feel the below when engaging in this/these behavior(s)?

In the process of my most recent I-deal negotiation:

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	All of the Time (5)
I had ongoing positive emotional experiences. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I experienced prolonged positive emotions. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My positive emotions kept re-surfacing. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Different situations kept bringing back my positive emotions. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I connected with others. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I socialized with others. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt included. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I was interested in interacting with others. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Others noticed me in a positive way. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt energized. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My energy level increased. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt re-connected to my work. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt energetic. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt stimulated. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Concerning your most recent I-deal negotiation, how frequently did you experience the emotions listed below when engaging in this/these behavior(s)

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Always (5)
Angry. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Frustrated. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disappointed. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Embarrassed. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Anxious. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guilty. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ignored. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discouraged. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hurt. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enthusiastic. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pleased. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Optimistic. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Grateful. (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compassionate. (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Happy. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proud. (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do what my job requires; this organization does not have the right to expect more. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I don't mind spending a half-hour past quitting time if I can finish a task. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The most important things that happen to me involve my work. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I live, eat and breath my job. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Most things in my life are more important than my work. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state your degree of agreement with statements below.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
All in all, I am satisfied with my job. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, I like my job. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, I like working here. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your current job?

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I often think about quitting. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I will probably look for a new job in the next year. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you believe that below statements reflect you

	Very Untrue (1)	Untrue (2)	Neutral (3)	True (4)	Very True (5)
I am willing to give my time to help others who have work related problems. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even when working under high pressure. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I assist others with their duties. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you believe that below statements reflect you

	Very Untrue (1)	Untrue (2)	Neutral (3)	True (4)	Very True (5)
I express loyalty toward the organization. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I keep up with developments in the organization. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I show pride when representing the organization in public. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I take action to protect the organization from potential problems. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you agree with below statements

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I like my supervisor very much as a person. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor is a lot of fun to work with. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

My supervisor would come to my defense if I were "attacked" by others. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do work for my supervisor that goes beyond what is specified in my job description. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I am willing to apply extra efforts beyond those normally required in order to meet his/her work goals. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am impressed with my supervisor's knowledge of his/her job. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I respect my supervisor's knowledge of and competence on the job. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I admire my supervisor's professional skills. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not mind working the hardest for him/her. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

You should rate how much the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Extraverted, enthusiastic. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reserved, quiet. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Anxious, easily upset. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Calm, emotionally stable. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In your job, how often does this employee engage in the following behaviors?
(Evaluated by focal employee's managers)

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Quite Often (4)	Very Often (5)
Make suggestions and produces ideas to improve current products, services, processes or practices. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acquire new knowledge and actively contribute to the development of new products, services, processes or practices. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Create new ideas for difficult issues. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Search out new working methods, techniques, or instruments. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Generate original solutions for problems. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mobilize support for innovative ideas. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acquire approval for innovative ideas. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Make important organizational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transform innovative ideas into useful applications. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Introducing innovative ideas into the work environment in a systematic way. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluating the utility of innovative ideas. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please state the extent to which you agree with below statements concerning this focal employee? (Evaluated by focal employee's managers)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
In general, this focal employees' performance is better than the work performance of most of co-workers. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This focal employees' performance is consistently of high quality. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The quality of this focal employees' performance fluctuates. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sometimes this focal employees' performance at work is not as good as it should be. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Compared to others in similar positions, this focal employees' performance is far above average. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Often this focal employees' performance level exceeds the expected standards of my job. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please think back to the most recent successful I-deal negotiation this employee had with you. How frequently did you feel the below during this process? (Evaluated by focal employees' managers for each focal employee)

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Always (5)
Happy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Optimistic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Joyful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Satisfied	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Relieved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Angry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Betrayed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disappointed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guilty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unhappy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix 3: Study 3 Survey

The following items are from Survey of Employees, in Workplace Employment Relations Study, 2011 (full survey is available on-line here, after registering for the UK Data Services:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/34814/11-804-wers6-workplace-study-2011-survey-of-employees.pdf).

Below are the survey items that are used in Study 3

Q1. In the last 12 months, have you made use of any of the following arrangements and if not, are they available to you if you needed them?

Name of the variable	I have used this arrangement	Available to me but I do not use	Not available to me	Don't know
Flexi-time				

Q2. Now, thinking about the managers in this workplace, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

Name of the variable	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Managers here treat employees fairly						

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about working here?

Name of the variable	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
I share many of the values of my organisation						
I feel loyal to my organisation						
I feel proud to tell who I work for						

The Coding of Control Variables of Study 3

Employee-Level Control Variables

The first row of the items below represents the name of the control variable and the second row represents the dummy-coding of the corresponding variable. These control variables are available on-line at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/34814/11-804-wers6-workplace-study-2011-survey-of-employees.pdf.

1. Gender

1 = Male; 2 = Female

2. Age

1 = 16-19, 2 = 20-29, 3 = 30-39, 4 = 40-49, 5 = 50-59, 6 = 60-64, 7 = 65 or more

3. Dependent children

1 = respondent had dependent children under the age of 18, 0 = otherwise

4. Workplace tenure

1 = less than a year, 2 = 1 to less than 2 years; 3 = 2 to less than 5 years; 4 = 5 to less than 10 years; 5 = 10 years or more

5. Managerial status

1 = managers, 2 = professionals, 3 = non-managers

6. Full-time versus part-time status

1 = permanent, 2 = temporary with no agreed end date, 3 = fixed period with an agreed end date

7. Membership of trade union or association

1 = yes, 2 = no, but have been in the past, 3 = no, never have been a member

8. Ethnicity

Coded into 17 categories; 1 = British, 2 = Irish, 3 = Any other white background, 4 = White and Black Caribbean, 5 = White and Black African, 6 = White and Asian, 7 = Any other Mixed Background, 8 = Indian, 9 = Pakistani, 10 = Bangladeshi, 11 = Chinese, 12 = Any other Asian Background, 13 = Caribbean, 14 = African, 15 = Any other Black Background, 16 = Arab, 17 = Any other Ethnic Group

9. Fixed/base wage

1 = mentioned, 0 = not mentioned.

Workplace-Level Control Variables

The first row of the items below represents the name of the control variable and the second row represents the dummy-coding of the corresponding variable. These control variables are available on-line at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/34811/11-803-wers6-sixth-workplace-study-management-questionnaire.pdf

1. Workplace size (continuous variable)

2. Organization size

Coded into 14 categories, e.g. 1 = 5 to 9

3. Whether a single independent workplace or otherwise

1 = one of a number of different workplaces in the UK, 2 = single independent workplace, 3 = sole UK establishment of a foreign organization

4. National ownership

Coded into 5 categories, e.g. UK owned/controlled

5. Union recognition

1 = yes, 2 = no

6. The formal status of the organization

Coded into 12 categories, e.g. 9 = public service agency

7. Number of years the workplace has been in operation, socio-economic group

0 = not classified, otherwise coded into 9 categories, e.g. 40 = professional workers/employees

8. Number of employees who are non-UK nationals

1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = don't know

9. Number of male employees in managers' and senior officials' group (continuous variable)

10. Number of female employees in managers' and senior officials' group (continuous variable)

11. Number of non-UK national employees in managers' and senior officials' group (continuous variable)

12. Major Standard Industrial Classification (2007)

1 = Manufacturing

2 = Construction, Gas, electricity and water supply

3 = Wholesale and retail trade

4 = Hotels and restaurants

5 = Transport, storage and communication

6 = Financial intermediation

7 = Real estate, renting

8 = Public admin., defence, social security

9 = Education

10 = Health and social work

11 = Other community, social, personal